

SUPPLEMENTS TO
VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE



Chrysostom as Exegete

*Scholarly Traditions and Rhetorical Aims
in the Homilies on Genesis*



SAMUEL POMEROY

BRILL

Chrysostom as Exegete

Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae

TEXTS AND STUDIES OF EARLY CHRISTIAN LIFE AND LANGUAGE

Editors-in-Chief

D.T. Runia
G. Rouwhorst

Editorial Board

B.D. Ehrman
K. Greschat
J. Lössl
J. van Oort
C. Scholten

VOLUME 171

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/vcs*

Chrysostom as Exegete

*Scholarly Traditions and Rhetorical Aims in the
Homilies on Genesis*

By

Samuel Pomeroy



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

This research was made possible by Research Foundation – Flanders (F.W.O.)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Pomeroy, Samuel, author.

Title: Chrysostom as exegete : scholarly traditions and rhetorical aims in the Homilies on Genesis / by Samuel Pomeroy.

Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, [2021] | Series: Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, 0920-623X ; volume 171 | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2021045713 (print) | LCCN 2021045714 (ebook) | ISBN 9789004469228 (hardback : acid-free paper) | ISBN 9789004469235 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: John Chrysostom, Saint, -407. | Bible—Hermeneutics. | John Chrysostom, Saint, -407. Homilies on Genesis. | Bible. Genesis—Sermons—History and criticism.

Classification: LCC BR65.C46 P66 2021 (print) | LCC BR65.C46 (ebook) | DDC 270.2092—dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2021045713>

LC ebook record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2021045714>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: “Brill”. See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0920-623X

ISBN 978-90-04-46922-8 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-46923-5 (e-book)

Copyright 2022 by Samuel Pomeroy. Published by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Hotei, Brill Schöningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau Verlag and V&R Unipress.

Koninklijke Brill NV reserves the right to protect this publication against unauthorized use. Requests for re-use and/or translations must be addressed to Koninklijke Brill NV via brill.com or copyright.com.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Preface IX

Acknowledgements XI

Abbreviations XIII

Note on the Text of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* in the *Patrologia Graeca* XVII

PART 1

Integrating Tradition and Rhetoric

- 1 Introduction: Integrating Tradition and Rhetoric 3
 - 1 Goals, Techniques, and Tools in Ancient Literary Scholarship 9
 - 2 Developments in Patristic Exegetical Traditions 13
 - 2.1 Canonical Cohesion 13
 - 2.2 Antiochene and Alexandrian Reception of Greek Literary Criticism 15
 - 2.3 Precision of Reference 19
 - 2.4 Self-Awareness of Tradition 22
 - 3 Questions-and-Answers and Genesis Exegesis 23
 - 4 Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* and Patristic Exegetical Traditions 31
- 2 The *Homilies on Genesis*, Old Testament Interpretation, and the Rhetoric of Obscurity 38
 - 1 The *Homilies on Genesis* in Recent Scholarship 39
 - 2 Provenance and Pedagogy of the *Homilies on Genesis* 45
 - 3 Commentary and Obscurity in Late Antiquity 52
 - 4 The Rhetoric of Obscurity in Antiochene Works 58
 - 5 The Rhetoric of Obscurity in the *Homilies on Genesis* 62
 - 6 Case Study: *Homily 37 on Genesis* 67
 - 6.1 Summary of Homily 37 68
 - 6.2 Between Obscurity and Opposition 69
 - 7 Conclusion 75
- 3 Questions and Answers in Tradition and Practice 77
 - 1 Disputing Exegetical Questions in Other Christian Homilies 80
 - 2 Posing Questions in the *Homilies on Genesis* 83

3	Variant Question Formulas	87
4	Providing Answers	91
5	Case Study: <i>Homily 29 on Genesis</i>	94
5.1	<i>Summary of Homily 29</i>	95
5.2	<i>Questions-and-Answers in Homily 29</i>	97
5.3	<i>Zetetic Rhetoric and Scholarly Traditions</i>	100
6	Conclusion	106
4	Grammar and Linguistic Analysis in Rhetorical Context	107
1	Glossing	109
1.1	<i>Glossing in Ancient Textual Commentary</i>	109
1.2	<i>Selections of Chrysostom's Glosses in the Homilies on Genesis</i>	113
1.3	<i>Glossing Formulations and Verbs</i>	114
1.4	<i>Psychology, Nature, and Anthropomorphism</i>	117
1.5	<i>Summary</i>	122
2	Habits of Scripture	123
2.1	<i>Formulations and Rhetorical Contexts of 'Habit'</i>	125
2.2	<i>Grammatical Features</i>	129
2.3	<i>Literary Features</i>	135
2.4	<i>Summary</i>	143
3	Onomastic Interpretation	144
3.1	<i>Onomastic Interpretation and the Homilies on Genesis</i>	146
3.2	<i>Framing Onomastic Interpretations</i>	148
3.3	<i>Making Meaning with Onomastic and Exegetical Traditions</i>	152
3.4	<i>Case Study: Homily 20 on Genesis</i>	156
4	Conclusion	161

PART 2

Engaging Exegetical Sources

5	John Chrysostom among the Antiochenes	165
1	Variant Readings	170
2	Describing Natural Phenomena or Objects in the Bible	175
2.1	<i>'Placing' the Stars</i>	175
2.2	<i>The 'Spirit' of God</i>	177
2.3	<i>The Serpent as 'Prudent'</i>	178
3	Narrative Coherence	181
3.1	<i>Abram's Migration</i>	182

3.2	<i>The First Theophany</i>	183
3.3	<i>The Duration of Slavery in Egypt</i>	183
3.4	<i>Jacob's Deathbed</i>	185
4	Departures from Eusebius and Diodore	187
4.1	<i>The Odor of Noah's Sacrifice</i>	187
4.2	<i>Consecration of the Sabbath Day</i>	188
4.3	<i>Abraham's Hospitality</i>	188
5	Disagreements with Eusebius or Diodore	189
5.1	<i>The Prohibition in the Garden</i>	189
5.2	<i>Abram's Altar</i>	190
5.3	<i>Noah's Diet</i>	191
6	Parallels to Ephrem	193
6.1	<i>The Harp of the Soul</i>	193
6.2	<i>The Robe of Glory</i>	195
6.3	<i>Garments of Skin</i>	196
6.4	<i>Retribution and Slander</i>	197
6.5	<i>Images of Resurrection</i>	198
7	Conclusion	200
6	John Chrysostom and Basil of Caesarea	203
1	Letter 260	205
2	Homily 1 on Fasting	209
2.1	<i>Shared Conceptual Formulations</i>	211
2.2	<i>Shared Biblical Texts</i>	212
2.3	<i>Adapted Quotation</i>	215
3	Homilies on the Six Day Creation	216
3.1	<i>Instantaneous Creation</i>	217
3.2	<i>Evening and Morning</i>	221
3.3	<i>The Royal Plural</i>	223
4	Conclusion	227
7	John Chrysostom and Eusebius of Caesarea	229
1	Typology	235
1.1	<i>Phares and Zara</i>	235
1.2	<i>The Blessing of Jacob</i>	239
2	Theophanies	243
2.1	<i>Biblical Citation Framework</i>	244
2.2	<i>Divine Nature</i>	246
2.3	<i>Human Form</i>	247
3	Conclusion	248

8 John Chrysostom among the Alexandrians	250
1 Elucidations of Biblical Texts	253
1.1 <i>Exegetical Intention and Technique</i>	255
1.2 <i>Shared Words and Formulations with Alexandrians</i>	257
1.3 <i>Non-Antiochene Ideas</i>	258
1.4 <i>Biblical Text and Spiritual Referents</i>	259
2 Exegetical Discussion	263
2.1 <i>Moral Propriety</i>	263
2.2 <i>Contradiction</i>	268
2.3 <i>Allegory</i>	270
3 Anthropological and Philosophical Argumentation	272
3.1 <i>Anthropological Argumentation</i>	273
3.2 <i>Philosophical Argumentation</i>	277
4 Typology	280
4.1 <i>The Rational Lamb (Aqedah)</i>	281
4.2 <i>Japheth and the Church</i>	283
5 <i>Testimonia</i> Collections	284
5.1 <i>Confirmations of Testimony Collections</i>	287
5.2 <i>Alexandrian and Antiochene Explanations</i>	289
6 Conclusion	291
Conclusion	295
1 Asking Exegetical Questions to Defamiliarize	296
2 Selecting and Modifying Exegetical Traditions for 'Symphonia'	299
3 Creating Non-literal Readings from Traditions of Name-and Word-Depth Study	301
4 Antiochene Debates about Non-literal Interpretations	303
Appendix 1: Occurrences of Ζήτημα and Ἀπορία in the <i>Homilies on Genesis</i>	305
Appendix 2: Sample Biblical Noun Glosses According to 'Habit' in Late Antique Christian Authors	311
Manuscripts Mentioned	312
Bibliography	313
Index of Modern Authors	353
Index of Greek Words	354
Index of Subjects	356
Index of Biblical Citations	361
Index of Ancient Literature	366

Preface

The ‘and’ in the subtitle of this book is meant as a conjunctive: in the homilies of John Chrysostom, I do not here intend for scholarly traditions to be understood as separate from their rhetorical aims. By ‘and’ neither do I denote a cataloguing of A followed by B, an analysis of traditions of Bible study in the *Homilies on Genesis* followed by a study of the preacher’s many paraenetic addresses coursing throughout our 67 homilies. Instead, I attempt to view the scholastic and the oratorical as two sides of the same, organic art intended for performance.

This said, however, it must be admitted that this study devotes more pages to the archaeology and categorization of the exegetical traditions on which Chrysostom draws, what Pierre Fruchon called the ‘prior community’. That is because while there are many studies that include John Chrysostom in a reception-history or effect-history analysis of Genesis exegesis, we know a limited amount about how Chrysostom interacted with the sizeable foundation work that had already been done on the book of Genesis by the late 4th-century. And in order to analyze the rhetorical purposes of tradition, which I accomplish by case-studies in Chapters 2, 3, and 4, that which Chrysostom received as tradition must also be established—chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8.

The important study of Hagit Amirav, as Frances Young recognized, suggests that much can be learned about the transmission of ideas and biblical learning in early Christianity by scrutinizing John Chrysostom’s approach to the teaching of the book of Genesis. His work illuminates an ongoing process of debate about patterns of reference around specific texts and offers the opportunity to examine how rhetorical context and the idealized aims of discourse factor into the choices made. The present volume, therefore, may be viewed as an extended analysis of the inspiring work of these two scholars.

If John Chrysostom possesses any originality in the history of the art of biblical interpretation, it is in his eclectic and almost compilatory practice on the one hand, and his at times brilliant application of technical questions to moral *paraenesis* on the other. This diversity of practice is likely the product of the contexts in which he worked and the resources at his disposal. I avoid the word ‘method’ because it is slightly misleading, implying the systematic strain for a coherence between hermeneutical theory and interpretative result that does not belong to our preacher. That is not to downplay the importance of such passages where hermeneutical theory comes to the fore—we have always famous passages like that in his *Homily 5 on Isaiah 6*, which captured Bultmann’s attention (see Chapter 2, n. 15). It is to stress rather that at the points where he can be tested, Chrysostom is not always internally consistent

(as Catherine Broc-Schmezer demonstrated so aptly) nor does he perform in the way we would expect of a student of Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore, raising again the question of context and tradition. While as a genre compilatory exegesis would flourish well after Chrysostom's time, a systematic study of his exegesis of Genesis deepens the conclusions of Amirav and Young and, I hope, provides us with a fuller profile of his activity insofar as it involved the bible, its interpretations, and the ways these traditions were employed for Christian self-understanding. Attending to Chrysostom helps us put an ear to the ground and, as it were, detect even if faintly how the waters of biblical science were flowing at the time.

Acknowledgements

It is my pleasure to thank those who have given of their time and energy to see this project into the harbor of completion. Since it began as a dissertation at the University of Leuven, I thank my promotor, supervisors, and collaborators there. Prof. Johan Leemans, the promotor, endured many drafts of this work by providing patient criticism, wise reference, and prompt response. Prof. Peter Van Deun set much aside to read and helpfully criticize both a full synopsis in skeletal outline and its attempted incarnation on the page. Similarly, Prof. Jos Verheyden graciously assessed a large portion of my writing progress, providing comments that caused me to take new steps which I believe to have produced much fruit. Profs. Geert Roskam and Gerd Van Riel were involved since this project set sail from its initial port, the working group *From Chaos to Order*.

Outside of Leuven, but thankfully connected to its orbit through one means or another, there are a number of colleagues and professors who deserve recognition. Seeds of this project were sown during an MLitt dissertation at the University of St Andrews (then) under Prof. Mark Elliott (now at Glasgow). For his guidance then and his continued support I am grateful. Prof. Lucas Van Rompay offered comments on early investigations, as did Prof. Mark DelCogliano. This project benefited from their time and consideration of some crucial details. Prof. Herman Teule also volunteered to teach me Syriac, which was a useful tool to aid the quality and scope of the research. On the note of acquiring tools, I thank Prof. Reinhart Ceulemans, whose expertise in the Greek *catenae* traditions proved to be an indispensable resource. Profs. Lorenzo Perrone, Alfons Fürst, Paul Blowers, and David Hunter are to be thanked for their interest in my work and stimulating discussion about the broad implications of some of my findings. In this connection, beyond precious bibliographic resources, at multiple stages, Prof. Wendy Mayer provided helpful questions and perspective that remained with me until the end. Finally, Prof. Margaret M. Mitchell volunteered to read the whole manuscript and offered invaluable criticisms and encouragements that enabled me to revise with a clearer vision. The anonymous reviewer for the *Supplements* series is also to be credited, especially for some crucial corrections to my methodology.

This book has benefited much from the involvement of Prof. Sébastien Morlet, and I thank him for his attention and critical interest at both early and late phases. Early, I benefited from a useful dialogue at the International Workshop in Oslo *Platonism and Christian Thought in Late Antiquity* in 2016. Late, he agreed to be the external corrector of the dissertation which served as the basis

for the present book. I am grateful for his efforts, attention to detail, inspiring command of the primary sources, and engaging criticism.

Despite the efforts of these outstanding scholars to help me, the reader of this book may find occasions for qualm. I hope that these occasions, which owe to my scruples and not their oversight, inspire future debate and research into the subjects presented here.

Finally, I thank my family. Without the encouragement and early efforts of my mother and father, I would not have had the opportunity to work in Leuven, nor the resolution to steer the ship into harbor. On ship-steering I must conclude with thanks to my wife, Cherie. Her wit, organization, and patience impacted this work in unquantifiable ways. I hope that these insufficient words go some way towards quantifying my gratitude for her presence in my life.

Abbreviations

AGLB	Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel
AKG	Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte
ASE	Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi
AW	Athanasius Werke
BA	Bible d'Alexandrie
BAC	The Bible in Ancient Christianity
BEFAR	Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium
BCESS	Bibliothèque des Centres d'Études Supérieurs Spécialisés
BEHE	Bibliothèque Economique des Hautes Études, Historiques et Philologiques
BGBE	Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BMFF	Berliner Mittelalter- und Frühneuzeitforschung
BTT	Bible de tous les temps
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAEC	Critical Approaches to Early Christianity
CAG	Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca
CBP	Cahiers de Biblia Patristica
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
CEC	Collection d'Études Classiques
CGOA	Claudii Galeni opera omnia
CGPNT	Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum
CNERU	Cordoba Near Eastern Research Unit
COMES	Civitatum Orbis Mediterranei Studia
CQ	Classical Quarterly
CRI	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
DER	Documents, Études et Répertoires Publiés par l'IRHT
EAA	Collection des Études augustinienes, Série Antiquité
EP	Interpretatio Omnium Epistolarum Paulinarum per Homilias Facta
ETL	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
FIO	Flavii Iosephi Opera
FKDG	Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, beinhaltet Dissertationen

FOC	Fathers of the Church
GCS nF	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte (neue Folge)
GG	Grammatici graeci
GNO	Gregorii Nysseni Opera
GO	Göttinger Orientforschungen
GRBS	Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies
HfM	Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser
HM	Homiliae in Matthaëum
HS	Hellenic Studies
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
ICS	Illinois Classical Studies
IPM	Instrumenta patristica et mediaevalia
IRSB	Publications de l'Institut Romand des sciences bibliques
JBAC ERG	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Ergänzungsband
JPCS	Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series
JECS	Journal of Early Christian Studies
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements
JSRC	Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture
JThS	Journal of Theological Studies
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
MUS	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OCA	Orientalia Christiana Analecta
OECS	Oxford Early Christian Studies
OECT	Oxford Early Christian Texts
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OPA	Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie
OSHT	Oxford Studies in Historical Theology
OTRM	Oxford Theology & Religion Monographs
OtSt	Oudtestamentische Studiën
PAO	Philonis Alexandrini Opera
PAR	Paradosis
PhAnt	Philosophia Antiqua
PL	Patrologia Latina
PG	Patrologia Graeca
PO	Patrologia Orientalis

PPS	Popular Patristics Series
PTA	Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
RB	Revue biblique
RE	Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft
RÉAug	Revue des études augustiniennes et patristiques
RÉByz	Revue des études byzantines
RSR	Recherches de sciences religieuses
SBA	Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft
SEA	Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum
SEO	Sexti Empirici Opera
SC	Sources chrétiennes
SGLG	Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SOS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SPA	Studien der Patristischen Arbeitsgemeinschaft
SPM	Studia Philonica Monographs
ST	Studi et testi
STAC	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
StPatr	Studia Patristica
STT	Studia Traditionis Theologiae
SVC	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae
TCH	Transformations of the Classical Heritage
TCSV	Trends in the Classics Supplementary Volumes
TeT	Temi e testi
TEG	Traditio Exegetica Graeca
ThHist	Théologie historique
TK	Texte und Kommentare
TRE	Theologische Realenzyklopädie
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
UaLG	Untersuchungen zu Antiken Literatur und Geschichte
VC	Vigiliae Christianae
VS	Verba Seniorum
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTG	Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WGRW	Writings from the Graeco-Roman World
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

ZAC	Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum
ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche

Note on the Text of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* in the *Patrologia Graeca*

The subject of this research, John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* (CPG 4409), is accessible in volumes 53 and 54 of the *Patrologia Graeca* (PG), first published in 1859. In itself, this text has no critical value. The surviving manuscript tradition containing all or parts of the series exceeds the staggering figure of 500 witnesses, some more complete than others. The text available in Migne's PG represents a fraction of this and is based on a twofold adaptation process without solid methodology. The point first to consider is that of Migne himself, the editor of the PG. The Greek text of PG 53–54 is a reproduction of the text edited by Montfaucon (1718–1738). As for Montfaucon's variant readings, Migne pillaged them with a selective, if not arbitrary eye: there is no clearly stated methodology for which variants make it into Migne's notes and which do not. But this brings us to the second adaptation of previous editions, that of Montfaucon's own edition. It cannot be called critical in the modern sense of the term. He did not present the riches at his disposal in an accessible way. With the resources of the then *Bibliothèque royale* available to him, this Benedictine scholar claimed to have consulted manuscripts not used by previous editions.¹ Yet, his method of listing variant readings is unclear; he offers no procedure and does not list the manuscripts used. Where they are mentioned, variant readings or emendations do not refer to their sources in the manuscripts.²

Another feature of Montfaucon's edition is that he combines the efforts of previous editions. In 1612, the edition of Savile appeared and sometime shortly thereafter, du Duc made an edition with reference to Savile and other manuscripts. Montfaucon used both du Duc and Savile, thereby supplementing his text and apparatus with a different pool of resources without clear state-

-
- 1 B. Mondrain, 'Bernard de Montfaucon et l'étude des manuscrits grecs', *Scriptorium* 66.2 (2012), 289–291. An account of the origin and development of the manuscripts in the BnF is in P. Augustin–J.-H. Sautel, *Codices chrysostomici graeci, VII: Codicum Parisinorum partem priorem*, DER 80 (Paris: CNRS Editions, 2011), and this volume also describes many of the manuscripts that witness to the *Homilies on Genesis*.
 - 2 W.A. Markowicz, *The Text Tradition of St. John Chrysostom's Homilies on Genesis and Mss. Michiganensis 139, 78 and Holkhamicus 61* (Diss. University of Michigan, 1953), 66–67; H. Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition: John Chrysostom on Noah and the Flood*, TEG 12 (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 56–57.

ment as to how and why. The resulting text in the PG 53–54 is thus a combination of multiple renaissance editions whose precise layering and relationships are unclear.³

Despite this lack of a modern critical edition, there are grounds for confidence in a degree of faithful representation⁴ of the Migne text because it is based, ultimately, on Savile. Savile, the early seventeenth-century scholar who worked with the resources of the Bodleian, is clearer than his predecessors about which manuscripts he used. Even though he does not present his apparatus with critical annotation, Savile's methodological transparency for establishing his text sets him apart from du Duc and Montfaucon. Savile explains that his edition is based on a collation of *Novi Collegii* 84 and 71, and *Magdalensis* 3. He also used an unknown manuscript to which he attributed great authority and antiquity, which he refers to as the *emendatissimus*.⁵ And herein lies another boon for Savile's text. Fortunately, he chose relatively reliable manuscripts. Markowicz's study of the manuscript tradition showed that Savile's manuscripts dated likely to the eleventh century. Relative to two of the three groups Markowicz marks for the manuscript tradition of the *Homilies on Genesis*, the manuscripts that Savile used possess few errors.⁶ While these

3 Markowicz, *Text Tradition*, 53–64 shows the variants between du Duc and Savile, noting that there is much agreement. F.J. Léroy, 'Les manuscrits de Montfaucon et l'Édition de s. Jean Chrysostome: notes sur quelques manuscrits du supplément grec, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris', *Traditio* 20 (1964), 411–418, overviews Montfaucon's handling and categorization of mss and papers grouped under the rubric 'Joannes Chrysostomus'.

4 G. Bady, 'La tradition des oeuvres de Jean Chrysostome, entre transmission et transformation', *REByz* 68 (2010), 151–152, speaks of 'degrees of authenticity' in the face of the likely impossibility of arriving at 'the original' of Chrysostom's works. Nevertheless, he suggests that the 'textual state' reflected in the ninth- to eleventh-centuries resurgence of transmission of Chrysostom's texts may provide a more epistemologically reliable foundation in comparison with modern editions made from manuscripts available at hand. Bady notes, further, that the textual tradition of the *Homilies on Genesis* stemming from these centuries is an example of a series which may 'gain as much in antiquity as in reliability'. Cf. G. Bady, 'Les manuscrits grecs des œuvres de Jean Chrysostom d'après la base de données Pinakes et les *Codices Chrysostomici Graeci* VII: Codicum Parisinorum pars prior', *Eruditio antiqua* 4 (2012), 68 for a chart distribution of the antiquity of Chrysostomian manuscripts in Paris available in the Pinakes database, 16% of which likely emerged from the Byzantine renaissance of the ninth- to eleventh-centuries. We await Crépey's critical edition of the *Homilies on Genesis* to deliver a more specific verdict as to the relative reliability of the text made available in the PG 53–54.

5 Markowicz, *Text Tradition*, 44–51.

6 Markowicz, *Text Tradition*, 260–261. Markowicz discerns three groups in the tradition: I, which represents an independent publication of stenographers; II, which represents Chrysostom's corrections; III, which represents an attempted harmony of the two (*ibid.*, 258). Notably, Savile used the 11th-century mss *Novi Collegii* 71. Markowicz recommended this manuscript

two factors, antiquity and relative accuracy, bode well for the reliability of the text established by Savile, we await the critical edition of *In Gen. hom.* 1–12 based on the doctoral thesis of Cyrille Crépey to place this conclusion in context and make steps towards clarifying the value of Savile's work.⁷ In a private correspondence, Crépey has expressed cautious optimism about some of the PG text, but suggested that based on a coalition independent of Savile's work, some significant corrections need to be made.⁸ This is a sign that work regarding our knowledge of Chrysostom's exegesis and preaching may be done on the PG text while holding as a possibility that certain philologically based points may become subject to dispute and revision in the wake of Crépey's edition—a monumental task which deserves our praise and support.

For our present purposes, then, we proceed with a cautious use of the PG 53–54. Because we cannot at any given moment be certain which group this text represents, our study does not operate on the basis that the form in which we study the texts was the form in which they were delivered by John Chrysostom. This study approaches the texts as units intended for delivery as idealized conceptions of the dynamics between rhetoric and tradition. While chapter 1

as the basis for Group III of *In Gen. hom.* 31–67, as it contains the least errors relative to the other manuscripts in this family. *Magdalensis* 3 Markowicz recommends for Group I of this section of the *Homilies*. Concerning the division of the groups in the manuscript tradition, see *ibid.*, 16–18 and Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 57. The series division that Markowicz makes between *In Gen. hom.* 1–30 and 31–67 is not the same thing as the division of groups in the manuscript tradition. The series division, roughly between the first half and second half of the 67 homilies, is due to its size and the fact that a lengthy pause in the liturgical season (Holy Week) is mentioned in John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 33.1 (PG 53.306); see C. Crépey, 'Les *Homélies sur la Genèse* de Jean Chrysostome: unité de la série, chronologie de la succession, provenance et datation', *RÉAug* 55.1 (2009), 90–101. Only rarely do we have a manuscript that contains all 67 homilies; *New College* 71 is one such manuscript, and so was, presumably, Savile's *emendatissimus*. See J.D. Cook, *Preaching and Popular Christianity. Reading the Sermons of John Chrysostom*, OTRM (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 37–46 on transmission of Chrysostom's homilies generally. Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.4.9 (GCS NF 1.316,12–13) mentions a distinction between Chrysostom's homilies as taken down by stenographers when he spoke and 'discourses that were given by him' (ἐκδοθέντες παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι). Following Mayer, Cook correlates these two versions to 'rough' and 'smooth' recensions of Chrysostom's works, and discusses the different possibilities for which audiences were intended by each recension. There is a deeper methodological problem, however. Bady, 'La tradition', 156 points out that in the case of many series, there is no evidence that Chrysostom himself 'reworked' his texts; cf. W. Mayer, *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom. Provenance: Reshaping the Foundations*, OCA 273 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2005), 361, who discusses this problem in relationship to the *Expositions on the Psalms*. Cook seems aware of this when he notes the possibility of scribal revision (33–34) in some cases.

7 C. Crépey, *Jean Chrysostome: Homélies sur la Genèse* (Diss. Paris IV-Sorbonne, 2004).

8 Dated 12 September 2020, private email correspondence.

demonstrates that the themes in the *Homilies on Genesis* fit amongst other works that can with greater certainty be dated to delivery in Chrysostom's early Antiochene period, the arguments are not dependent on this being the case.

PART 1

Integrating Tradition and Rhetoric



[When God explains his creation to us] the world ceases to be scattered vocabulary, it has become a poem, it has meaning, it has order, it comes from something and is going somewhere [...] we have our place and our role within it.

– PAUL CLAUDEL, *Introduction au livre de Ruth* (59–60)

• • •

Here there is no random succession, a mere variety of conceptions; rather by constantly following models and developing them, a tradition is formed with which every new attempt must come to terms. The performing artist too has a certain consciousness of this. The way that he approaches a work or a role is always in some way related to models that approached it in the same way. But this has nothing to do with blind imitation. Although the tradition created by a great actor, director, or musician remains effective as a model, it is not a brake on free creation, but has become so fused with the work that concern with this model stimulates an artist's creative interpretive powers no less than does concern with the work itself. The performing arts have this special quality: that the works they deal with are explicitly left open to such re-creation and thus visibly hold the identity and continuity of the work of art open towards its future.

– HANS-GEORG GADAMER, *Truth and Method* (118–119)

• •
•

Introduction: Integrating Tradition and Rhetoric

As a preacher whose mass-communication task involved the explanation of the Scriptures, John Chrysostom resembled what Hans-Georg Gadamer identified as the hermeneutical character of the performing artist. Gadamer's fusion of tradition and work speaks about presuppositions 'with which every new attempt must come to terms'. This is captured not so much by Howard Johnson's 2016 *Shylock is My Name*, the imaginative contemporary rewriting of Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*, but rather better by the 2004 film adaptation of the play in which Al Pacino played the lead, Shylock. Because it interprets a model, we may say that Pacino's performance was effected, deliberately or not, by previous performances of the same, such as Patrick Stuart's in the 1978 *Royal Shakespeare Company* production. When John Chrysostom, the prolific fourth-century Greek preacher in the Roman province of Syria, set to explain his bible to his public, a profusion of exegetical models was available to him. He negotiated these models and placed them into his wider rhetorical purposes. Deliberately or not, just as Pacino performing for film and Stuart performing for *rsc*, he responded to his models according to the circumstances of his liturgical, pastoral, and political situation.

Recently, sharpened scrutiny of John Chrysostom's work has clarified the lineaments of his intellectual profile. Fruitful studies have situated him in relation to the traditions of medico-philosophical rhetoric and anti-intellectual Greco-Roman *paideia* on the one hand, and an eclectic Alexandrian-Antiochene biblical exegesis and Basilian-Meletian Homoiousian theology on the other. Given the volume of his literary heritage (not always a straightforward one, however), studying Chrysostom in relation to his sources illuminates the wider landscape of the transmission of ideas in early Christianity, particularly as concerns the complex dynamics between biblical text, tradition of commentary, preacher, and intended audience. The purpose of this book is to view these elements in their integrality. One of these elements, tradition of commentary, has been notoriously difficult to trace due to the lack of surviving works in Chrysostom's immediate circle. But recent advancements in the production of critical text editions of compilation literature, such as the Genesis *catenae* and Procopius's *Commentary on Genesis*, enable the possibility to clarify to unprecedented depths how Chrysostom stood in relation to his contemporaries and predecessors. But in the context of a homily, exegesis never serves an end in itself; it is always oriented towards a more complex rhetorical purpose. Exege-

sis becomes a vital imaginative resource by which the preacher ascribes different quantitative values to ethical and spiritual ‘spaces’ created within the discourse.¹ A rhetorical analysis of tradition’s effects may thereby show how, from the perspective of one preacher, the transmission of ideas factored into his own presentation of biblical teaching for a popular audience. Considering Gadamer’s approach further will provide a general grammar from which to identify the priorities of our study in relation to recent advancements in the study of patristic exegetical traditions.

Gadamer deepened his understanding of tradition by considering it as a dialogical phenomenon. The resulting framework is essential for grasping the methodology of this book, which seeks to view in integrality three key elements within Chrysostom’s homilies: exegetical tradition, Chrysostom’s own exegetical choices, and the rhetorical purposes to which he placed this fusion.

For Gadamer, the text and the interpreter interact as a conversation which proceeds by question and answer, the former taking priority.² To interpret the text is to treat the text as an answer to a question, a question now at least partially lost to empirical historical knowledge. But the attempted reconstruction of the question enables an engagement with the horizon of expectations which gave rise to the text. From this circle, the interpreter addresses his or her own questions. This helps describe the process of the second and third elements, Chrysostom’s own exegetical choices and how he presents them as answers to previous questions. But how do these elements interact with the first, the prior exegetical tradition?

Gadamer’s student Jauss, who developed the theoretical framework of *Rezeptionsgeschichte* in distinction to his teacher’s *Wirkungsgeschichte*, illuminated where tradition fits into this process. The category of reception refocuses the aesthetic experience of the interpreter interacting with models of question and answer.³ As Elliott explains it, ‘any new understanding of a text in the light of another one is anchored to past understandings and misunder-

1 J. Stenger, *Johannes Chrysostomos und die Christianisierung der Polis. »Damit die Städte Städte werden«*, STAC 115 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 20.

2 It was from the *Biography* of R.G. Collingwood that Gadamer drew this notion: H.-G. Gadamer, *Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990), 381; R. Boutet, ‘La métaphysique en dialogue: sur l’appropriation herméneutique de Platon par H.-G. Gadamer’, *Archives de Philosophie* 77:3 (2014), 471–488 discusses Gadamer’s understanding of dialogue in-depth.

3 This is elaborated in J. Jauß, *Aesthetische Erfahrung und literarische Hermeneutik* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1982), but see also the essays in *ibid.*, *Literatur in Alterität und Modernität der Mittelalterlichen Literatur: Gesammelte Aufsätze, 1956–1976* (München: Fink, 1977), esp. 11–14.

standings ... we are never the first to join in the questioning and answering'.⁴ Fruchon went so far as to characterize this tradition as a 'prior community' (*communauté préalable*), and it is this community which enables interpretative dialogue with the text.⁵ Thus the dialogical framework which Gadamer understood as constitutive of text and interpreter is applied schematically to include the historical conditioning of question and answer by previous models. Anticipating Jauss, Blumenberg had already applied the phenomenon of dialogue to understand the features of early Christian intellectual tradition.⁶ Considering Blumenberg's move is instructive for further articulating how tradition, interpreter, and context may be integrated.

In a grossly neglected essay, Blumenberg viewed the self-understanding of Christian theology as the answer to a question posed by pagan philosophy. Early Christian theology, he argued, presented itself as 'New' by formulating its propositions as a 'decisive response' (*Antwort auftreten*) to the 'Old'. In doing so, tradition in early Christianity constituted the 'tracing in the body of previous knowledge its very own fundamental questions'.⁷ What, exactly, is this 'previous knowledge' (*Bestand des Alten*)? Blumenberg provided examples such as the *Divine Institutes*, whose author Lactantius had proposed it as a novel *summa* which would assemble fragments of the truth scattered throughout the ancient philosophers and place them into a coherent, faultless system.⁸ The criterion of truth for Lactantius was, of course, the anthropological teachings of the Scriptures.⁹ For Blumenberg, Lactantius sought the motivation of the questions posed in biblical and pagan literature by posing his own questions.¹⁰ But

4 M. Elliott, *The Heart of Biblical Theology. Providence Experienced* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), 59.

5 P. Fruchon, 'Exégèse biblique et tradition', *Esprit* 366 (1967), 885–886.

6 In this book I use 'early Christian' to connote the wider cultural milieu in which Christianity developed as a religious phenomenon, and I use 'patristic' to connote more specifically the group of known authors and figures involved in creating traditions of textual interpretation. I acknowledge that the distinction is problematic, and the categories overlap.

7 H. Blumenberg, 'Kritik und Rezeption antiker Philosophie in der Patristik. Strukturanalysen zu einer Morphologie der Tradition', A. Haverkamp (ed.), *Ästhetische und metaphorologische Schriften* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2001), 272–273. I rely here on the study of P.-A. Alt, 'Traditions and the Dynamics of Change: Preliminary Thoughts on a Key Issue in Early Modern Studies', in A.J. Johnston et al. (eds.), *Transforming Topoi. The Exigencies and Impositions of Tradition*, BMEF 23 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018), 32–33.

8 Blumenberg, 'Kritik und Rezeption', 269.

9 M. Perrin, *L'homme antique et chrétien: l'anthropologie de Lactance*, 250–325, *ThHist* 59 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1981), 30.

10 Cf. R.B. Pippin, 'Blumenberg and the Modernity Problem', *The Review of Metaphysics* 40.3 (1987), 556–557.

not all ideas flowed in such a clearly defined direction and structure of tradition. Blumenberg's study of the phenomenon of early Christian tradition must be viewed within his wider metaphorology and his response to Löwith's conception of idea-constants carrying over from one epoch to another (primarily the modern notion of progress as a secularized version of premodern eschatology).¹¹ Like Ricœur, Blumenberg understood tradition as constraint at the level of form and function.¹² Thus, continuity across epochs may be conceived through a one-way flow of dependence, and hence less as a dialogical form imagined by Jauss. Indeed, Blumenberg held that new teachings or interpretative patterns could only be deployed if previous models were invoked and transformed, and for this his use of Lactantius' *Divine Institutes* fits rather well: the 'Old' philosophy was reinvented, made to speak upon the same plane as biblical literature, for the questions of the 'New.' It thereby reveals what Blumenberg took to be 'das prinzipielle Dilemma der Patristik' which was 'on the one hand to represent the absolute claim and exertion of a new teaching and yet, on the other hand, be allowed to place the old teaching so far into falsity that they can no longer be pressed into service'.¹³ Blumenberg's formulation thereby calls attention to the dynamics of tradition as a process in which preceding problems shape 'our' questions and answers. This analysis of the rhetoric of tradition brings our focus to the ways authors conceived their teachings in light of the awareness of previous models—searching for the motivation of some questions by looking at previous answers—and so helps construe our approach to biblical exegetical traditions which operated similarly.

For our purposes, Blumenberg's view of the flow of questions complements Jauss's priority of the aesthetic dialogical experience of the reader. Together these may be sharpened by incorporating Young's account of patristic exegetical tradition. She writes, 'Traditions of interpretation [of Biblical texts] there certainly were. Sometimes these suggest methodological differences, but more often they reflect debates about reference which accumulate around specific texts'.¹⁴ Building on Amirav's study of three *Homilies on Genesis* by John Chrysostom, which integrates Chrysostom's engagement with exegetical traditions

11 H. Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, R. Wallace (trans.) (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985), 8.

12 S. Hawkins, 'Theory of a Practice: A foundation for Blumenberg's metaphorology in Ricœur's theory of Metaphor', *Thesis Eleven* 155.1 (2019), 97: 'latent and overt metaphors endure across epochs as a way of structuring our thought'.

13 Blumenberg, 'Kritik und Rezeption', 275.

14 F. Young, 'Traditions of Exegesis', in J.C. Paget–J. Schaper (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible. From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 734.

into his rhetorical aims, Young concludes that patristic exegetes shared many methodological points in common, and where they diverged, diverged more over patterns or correspondences of text-referent.¹⁵

Perhaps a useful metaphor to infer from Young's statement is that individual biblical texts functioned like webs. Various interpreters drew into the ambit of a particular text-web a referent concerning its value or role in the history of salvation. Along with competing claims for the referent(s), so too were drawn in corresponding exegetical techniques, parallel biblical texts, and rhetorical performances. Because there is considerable repetition of both the text and referent correspondence and the techniques used to establish these correspondences across different authors and genres, we may posit a degree of learning, of shared knowledge, that makes possible the accumulation of these webs. Thus, these traditions may be deemed 'scholarly', even though the degree of learning and individual nuance differed considerably amongst authors and we cannot presuppose a uniform scholastic environment behind disparate contexts. I discuss this further below, as there are significant advancements and open questions in the field of studying these scholarly exegetical traditions in early Christianity. For the present purpose of establishing a wider grammar for the key terms and methodology of this study, it suffices to say that the notion of dialogue through revision derived from Jauss and Blumenberg may be applied to assess the tone and context of the various interpretative events which navigate and so contribute to these webs, bringing to the fore how an author engaged the Old-New dynamic within various text-webs.

Indeed, as Chrysostom's homilies demand, the use of scholarly exegetical traditions must be viewed in their rhetorical context. Meeting this demand may prove useful to wider developments in contemporary biblical criticism and 'theological interpretation'. Many have taken reception-study to mean something like the examination of a chain of voices stemming from the text and bridging with the conceptual apparatus of the interpreter.¹⁶ But if Jauss's chief

15 Young, 'Traditions of Exegesis', 745.

16 For example: W. Lamb (ed.-trans.), *The Catena in Marcum. A Byzantine Anthology of Early Commentary on Mark*, TENTS 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 5, 7–8, acknowledges the confusion created by the use of *Wirkungsgeschichte* as applied by theological studies. Following Ricœur, he identifies the value of patristic exegesis as testifying to 'the way in which a particular text or narrative can be translated, repeated, refigured and rewritten in different communities of reading and interpretation ... the identification of these trajectories in biblical interpretation amounts to much more than a rather antiquarian interest in historical theology ... they continue to shape and form the consciousness of those engaged in the enterprise of interpretation'. His concern, however, is with the 'assumptions and pre-suppositions' which are 'at work in contemporary debates'. Similarly, the 'Patristic Recep-

concern in *Rezeptionsgeschichte* was to trace the aesthetic experience of the reader, the lucidity of this tracing may be enhanced by attending to the interpretative experience of past readers and how tradition was construed in their own practice. To do this, what individual readers and interpreters actually received as tradition must be identified. The present volume thereby heavily involves the reconstruction of John Chrysostom's web (Part Two), so as to assess his own engagement with it.

Having thus illustrated the need for accounting for what I have presented as the threefold aesthetic experience of Chrysostom as exegete, the following working definitions of the key terms in the title of this book are proposed to frame the methodology throughout.

- By 'tradition' of scholarly exegesis I understand the construction of a correspondence between biblical text and its proposed referent(s) that, across different authors and genres, accumulates nuanced techniques and ideas for supporting, adjusting, or revising this correspondence. 'Patristic exegetical tradition' refers to the viewing of these constructions as an abstract collective phenomenon but does not necessarily imply a wooden transmission of ideas from one author to another.
- By 'rhetorical aims' I understand the experience of revising previous traditions for the sake of a particular context. It thereby considers an author's own understanding of a previous tradition and the value it bears for his or her own purposes.

In the remainder of this introduction, it will be useful to survey contemporary advances in the reconstruction of scholarly exegetical traditions and the contexts in which notable developments occurred. In turn, this will enable us to situate John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* within the rhetorical contexts of early Christianity in which the teaching of Scripture flourished, especially forms relating to questions-and-answers.

tion' of Rom 13,¹ is the foreground of long case-study (extending into the 20th-century) of R. Evans, *Reception History, Tradition and Biblical Interpretation: Gadamer and Jauss* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 144–179. Evans performs this study in order to evaluate one prominent approach to *Wirkungsgeschichte* which valorizes the exemplary, or what Jauss referred to as the 'high crest' authors of a tradition. His point is to demonstrate that such selections involve value judgments about which authors or media matter, and that they relate his own interpretation to the tacit operation of the principles offered by such past authorities in contemporary interpretation. We may go a step further than Evans and say that while such canonical selections place into relief the 'life praxis of the [contemporary] reader' (Elliott, *The Heart of Biblical Theology*, 59), they tend to obscure the life praxis of the readers of the past, reducing patristic voices to links in a chain and not examining how, exactly, the links are connected in the first place.

1 Goals, Techniques, and Tools in Ancient Literary Scholarship

To explain difficulties and analyze the content of the bible, patristic exegetical traditions used the techniques and goals of ancient literary scholarship. By the fourth-century, many of these techniques had been popularized by the rhetorical schools, and they were also in use in philosophical circles which relied heavily on the exegesis of school-founders for their doctrine. It is difficult to reconstruct the relationship in Late Antiquity between the teaching of grammar, the criticism of literature (including not just poetry such as Homer but speeches such as Demosthenes), and training for public oratory in which tools from other disciplines were assimilated based on the needs of the context. As we focus on Greek authors, a careful examination of patristic exegesis shows adaptation of Greco-Roman literary criticism at three levels: 1) the primary goal of establishing a or the¹⁷ ὑπόθεσις ('over-all argument') or νόυς ('thought') of a text in relation to a culture of moral improvement, often conceived of the 'mystery of Christ' which overrode linguistic concerns;¹⁸ 2) general methodological approaches such as the concern to establish 'clarity' in the face of apparently contradictory texts or the identification of forensic elements in a speech or text; 3) specific technical questions posed, including discussions of topography and geography, the identification of literary tropes, the resolution of obscurities or potential problems such as narrative contradiction, and the value of variant readings of a given text.¹⁹

Idealized reconstruction from the rhetorical schools and the scholia indicate that variation on a five-fold procedure encompasses a typical application of these techniques for exegesis: quotation of the lemma; provision of trans-

17 As M. Heath, 'John Chrysostom, Rhetoric, and Galatians', *Biblical Interpretation* 12.4 (2004), 375, points out, we should be careful in our use of the definite article on this point: exegetes in mid-to-late antiquity could identify multiple aims to a single text.

18 F. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 248; A. Viciano, 'Das formale Verfahren der Antiochenischen Schriftauslegung', in G. Schöllgen–Clemens Scholten (eds.), *Stimuli. Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum*, JAC ERG 23 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1996), 390–391. B. Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned: Christophanic Exegesis and the Making of a Christian Bible*, BAC 13 (Leiden: Brill, 2019), supplies the notion of the 'mystery of Christ' as an essential element practiced by patristic exegetes, without meaningful structural parallel to Greco-Roman models.

19 B. Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe*, SBA 18.1–2 (Basil: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1987). His work was inspired by Ch. Schäublin, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der Antiochenischen Exegese*, Theophaneia 23 (Cologne–Bonn: Hanstein, 1974), who investigated the same question in regard to Antiochene authors. Schäublin already concluded that Origen bequeathed many pagan grammatical and literary techniques to Diodore and Theodore.

lation or discussion of variant readings; provision of paraphrase or glossing; citing parallel quotations; explanation by the commentator.²⁰ Some grammatical traditions understood the ‘explanation’ (ἐξηγητικόν) element as possessing a systematic procedure in its own right, such as the clarification of words, rhetorical analysis, metrical and stylistic evaluation, and analysis of historical facts and realities in a text.²¹ In Christian literature, particularly in texts intended for public delivery, only rarely do we meet systematic structure by all five aspects. Such schematic presentations do not adequately account for how rhetorical exegesis was exercised in its diverse forms of mature application. Furthermore, and this point shall become crucial for discussing the genre of Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Genesis*, Berglund rightly insists that ‘there is a certain difference between an occasional use of these techniques in an argumentative context and a systematic application of all relevant techniques to passage after passage of a continuous text in a fully developed lemmatic commentary.’²² John Chrysostom’s works are known to incorporate a wide variety of techniques and clues that belong to various contexts, such as the scholastic teacher-disciple relation or medico-philosophical therapy. Another profitable dimension, studied in the present volume, is the wider practice of questions-and-answers in early Christian scriptural commentary and doctrinal instruction. But the establishment of this basic set of shared scholastic expectations across Christian literature—what to talk about when talking about a

20 Here I bring to the fore the evidence from the scholia reconstructed by R. Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work. Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 8. Doing so helps bear in mind the basic insight of Neuschäfer and Schaublin (see preceding note), which relies on the scholia (on textbooks like Dionysius Thrax *Art of Philology*) and works fragmentarily preserved therein (such as Porphyry’s *Homeric Questions*) for the material which parallels to the procedures of patristic exegetes such as Origen, Theodore, and Diodore. Another factor to consider in the reconstruction of basic orientations to ancient philology is introductory material (also found frequently but not exclusively in scholia). J. Mansfeld, *Prolegomena. Questions to be Settled Before the Study of an Author or a Text*, *Philosophia Antiqua* 61 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 22–26 surveys how, in introductions to various works, ancient scholars articulated the planned issues of textual commentary, such as dealing with obscurity and clarity, the title and sections, and habits of speech. Only in later Byzantine traditions were these priorities systematized, however.

21 Dionysius Thrax, *Ars gramm.* 1 (GG 1/1.5,5). For further discussion of the importance of this text for patristic exegetical traditions, P.W. Martens, *Origen and Scripture: The Contours of the Exegetical Life*, OECs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 46 and C.J. Berglund, ‘Interpreting Readers: The Role of Greco-Roman Education in Early Interpretation of New Testament Writings’, in F. Wilk (ed.), *Scriptural Interpretation at the Interface between Education and Religion. In memory of Hans Conzelmann*, TBN 22 (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 226–227.

22 Berglund, ‘Interpreting Readers’, 237.

text—permitted further work to clarify what kind of priorities and emphases emerge from the Christian use of scholarly exegetical traditions.

A telling sign of a learned culture across patristic exegetical traditions is the application of certain phases in an envisioned exegetical procedure. To paraphrase a word or text, for instance, exegetes would use formulations such as ‘this here’ (τὸ δέ) to specify the text they wished to paraphrase, and ‘instead of’ (ἀντὶ τοῦ) to introduce their interpretation of the word/s.²³ Another example occurs in the exegesis of Paul’s letters, for which the identification of forensic speech components was prominent. Exegetes such as Chrysostom or Theodoret could identify where the text of a Pauline letter ‘transitions to another head’ (κεφάλαιον μεταβαίνει), such as moving from the introduction (προσίμιον) to the first of the arguments (ἀγῶνες).²⁴

Linguistic concepts give further shape to the priorities of patristic exegetical tradition. ‘Habit’ (ἔθος), ‘use’ (συνήθεια), or ‘idiom’ (ιδίωμα) marked the exegete’s attempt to identify regular grammatical and lexical peculiarities in the bible.²⁵ These concepts had the advantage of explaining what appeared to be unfamiliar ways of speaking or drawing attention to important details in the narrative which could be related to recurring features. In most cases where ‘habit’ and related concepts are invoked, the exegete knows that parallel texts must be adduced to prove the point. More specifically focused on the grammatical level, the mention of a ‘modification’ (ἐναλλαγὴ), often in reference to the bizarre use of verbal tenses in the Septuagint, could signal to the reader that the text was not adhering to normal significations.²⁶

23 In Homeric scholarship: Nünlist, *Ancient Critic*, 15; in Christian scholarship: Schäublin, *Untersuchungen*, 95–96. I discuss this more in Chapter 4.

24 Heath, ‘Chrysostom, Rhetoric and Galatians’, 376.

25 The ancient Homeric commentator Aristarchus addressed the notion of ‘habit’ on numerous occasions, such as discussing Greek dialects by comparisons: F. Schironi, *The Best of the Grammarians: Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 2018), 399. See M. Niehoff, ‘Philo and Plutarch on Homer’, in M. Niehoff (ed.), *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*, JSRC 16 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 142 for discussion of how Late Antique commentators on Homer adapted the reference to Homeric habit for their own moral pedagogical purposes. For use of the technique in Christian authors, starting with Origen, see Neuschäfer, *Origenes*, 1:143 and L. Perrone (ed.), *Origenes. Die neuen Psalmenhomilien. Eine kritische Edition des Codex Monacensis Graecus 314*, GCS NF19 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 13 which highlight his use of συνήθεια in lexical study. For Theodore of Mopsuestia’s use of ‘habit’ for lexical and grammatical study of the Septuagint (especially the Psalms), see R. Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*, ST 141 (Vatican City, Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana 1948), 58–68.

26 The technique was also used in grammatical works to discuss other instances such as mod-

For literary tropes, allegory or the ‘hidden sense’ may be invoked by suggesting that in the text was an ‘enigma’ or ‘mystery’ (ἀνύγμια).²⁷ Synecdoche, metaphor, summary, and others are frequently identified in Biblical commentary and exegesis.²⁸ Terminology expressing the subject’s ‘fittingness’ (ἀνάρμοστον and πρέπον), marked inquiry about whether a word, expression, action, or speech was appropriate for the given situation, often in reference to what is known or expected of a particular character such as the benevolence of God.²⁹ In biblical exegesis, these techniques and many others were essential in the establishment or revision of specific text-reference correspondence.

Alongside these reading techniques, we may also mention innovative tools used to master the complexity and diversity of biblical material within the Late Antique ‘culture of the book’.³⁰ For example, in the 3rd-century, Origen and a work crew constructed the Hexapla, a parallel apparatus for viewing multiple Greek versions of the Jewish scriptures together. Many exegetes, including those in Chrysostom’s immediate Antiochene context, used this tool in a systematic way in their biblical commentaries.³¹ In another case, a generation

ification of case, number, and gender. For example, see L. Basset, ‘Apollonius between Homeric and Hellenistic Greek: The Case of the Pre-positive Article’, in S. Matthaios et al. (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar: Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*, TCSV 8 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 253–255. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.2–27 labelled these observations with a variety of terms related to *mutatio*: ἀλλαγῇ, ὑπαλλαγῇ, ἐναλλαγῇ, ἀλλοίωσις. See further C. de Jonge, ‘Grammatical Theory and Rhetorical Teaching’, in F. Montanari et al. (eds.), *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Scholarship*, 1002 for overviews in classical scholarship. Among Christian commentators, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore used this technique especially in regard to verbal modifications; see Devreesse, *Essai*, 60 for a helpful list of verbal modifications which Theodore found in the Psalms, and further L. Mariès, *Études préliminaires à l’édition du Commentaire de Diodore de Tarse sur les Psaumes* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1933), 112–115; A. Léonas, *Recherches sur le langage de la Septante*, OBO 211 (Friburg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2005), 208.

27 It is important, however, not to view this as a univocal term for suggesting an allegorical reference, as cautioned by R. Nünlist, ‘Aristarchus and Allegorical Interpretation’, in Matthaios (ed.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar*, 117.

28 See J. Lössl, ‘When is a Locust just a Locust? Patristic Exegesis of Joel 1:4 in the Light of Ancient Literary Theory’, *JThS* 55.2 (2004), 578 for discussion of Theodore of Mopsuestia’s mention of metaphor in the Old Testament in comparison with comments in the Homeric scholia.

29 See M. Pohlenz, ‘Τὸ πρέπον: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des griechischen Geistes’, *NAWG—Philologisch-historische Klasse* 1 (1933), 53–93 for Homeric scholarship; see Martens, *Adrian’s* Introduction, 49–50 for cases of Christian application of this technique.

30 A. Grafton–M. Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book. Origen, Eusebius and the Library of Caesarea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), 28–29.

31 A useful starting point for the study of this text is A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments. Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew*

after Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea created an ingenious table system which placed parallel Gospels texts in comparative relationship.³² This successful tool was also accompanied by his *Questions on the Gospel*, a collection of literary-critical discussions on problems of contradiction and coherence emerging from detailed comparison of parallel gospel texts.

The present volume shows how Chrysostom deployed such scholarly techniques and tools as part of his engagement with previous models of exegesis. But as the discussion of Blumenberg's contribution makes clear, it is important to view these techniques and tools as responses to questions, and we clarified that particularly in the case of exegetical traditions, the questions came from internal situations just as much as they resulted from adapting 'outside' (pagan) literary critical methods.

2 Developments in Patristic Exegetical Traditions

To appreciate the underlying questions that generated the development of patristic traditions in Late Antiquity, we may distinguish between canonical cohesion, Antiochene vs. Alexandrian reception of Greek literary criticism, precision of reference in theology and school environments, and self-awareness of tradition.

2.1 Canonical Cohesion

Problems that are best understood as internal to the Christian community explain several important developments in the scholastic nature of patristic exegetical tradition, though as we shall see, between 'internal' and 'external' there were porous boundaries. The recent study of Berglund on the development of early Christian exegetical science offers an important perspective in this regard. Ayres and Wucherpfennig had studied the debates over 'Valentinian' Christian views in Irenaeus and Origen.³³ These cases offer some of our

and *Jewish Studies*, 25th July–3rd August 1994 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998). For Antiochene reception, see J.-N. Guinot, 'La fortune des Hexaples d'Origène aux IV^e et V^e siècles en milieu antiochien', in M. Alexandre et al. (eds.), *Origeniana Sexta. Origène et la Bible*, BETL 118 (Leuven: Peeters, 1995), 243–254; R.B. ter Haar Romeny, *A Syrian in Greek Dress: The Use of Greek, Hebrew and Syriac Biblical Texts in Eusebius of Emesa's Commentary on Genesis*, TEG 6 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997). I discuss this in greater depth in Chapters 4 and 5.

32 See the study of its composition and reception, M. Crawford, *The Eusebian Canon Tables. Ordering Textual Knowledge in Late Antiquity*, OECS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).

33 L. Ayres, 'Irenaeus vs. the Valentinians: Towards a Rethinking of Patristic Exegetical Ori-

earliest evidence for the Christian use of the standards of Greco-Roman literary criticism, such as the debate over a biblical text's 'inner logic' or 'sequence' (ἀκολουθία). Irenaeus, Ayres says, shared the 'exegetical culture' of his opponents, the Valentinians. This exegetical culture is exemplified by Irenaeus using literary critical terminology to debate the proper application of allegory to certain passages from the Gospel of John.³⁴ But Berglund asks what changes in the expectations of the audience demanded an increased application to these procedures; why did they become authoritative for theological argumentation? Extending a point made by Young about the Jewish and Christian concern for 'unitive exegesis',³⁵ Berglund points to the concomitant rise of the canon and the phenomenon of 're-written' bible.³⁶ Seeking to establish a new literary authority around their expression of Christian identity in a highly educated context, internal Christian debates about inner logic of texts, thematic coherence, and recurring theological referents generated increased application to literary critical techniques. Generally, this is the point at which allegorical interpretation is marked as emerging into the Christian toolkit as a philological technique to explain seemingly inappropriate, absurd, or erroneous things in the text.³⁷ In the post-Nicene generation, Viciano observes, this creative context enabled theologians to contemplate 'the human side of creating sacred books', for which they could use the hermeneutical aims expressed in the prologues of commentary tradition to balance their view of divine inspiration.³⁸

If Irenaeus and Origen represent a nascent point, Adrian's *Introduction to the Divine Scriptures* represents a mature point. This text (difficult to reconstruct in its entirety) shows just how sophisticated and programmatic the transmission of patristic exegetical traditions became by the second half of the fifth century. Adrian's *Introduction* is a catalogue of grammatical and literary devices identified in the Greek bible: metaphors and anthropomorphic speech, comparison, synecdoche, summary and recapitulation, irony, tragedy, change of tense, and many more. Most interestingly for our purposes, Martens' apparatus of the critical edition of the *Introduction* demonstrates numerous parallels between Adrian and other exegetes, especially Antiochenes Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret. These authors knew many

gins', *J ECS* 23.2 (2015) 153–187; A. Wucherpfennig, *Heracleon Philologus: Gnostische Johannesexegese im zweiten Jahrhundert*, WUNT 142 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).

34 Ayres, 'Irenaeus', 155.

35 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 20; 93.

36 Berglund, 'Interpreting Readers', 241.

37 J. Pépin, 'À propos de l'histoire de l'exégèse allégorique: l'absurdité, signe de l'allégorie', *StPatr* 1 (1957), 395–413.

38 Viciano, 'Das formale Verfahren', 391.

of the same text-referent correspondences identified in Adrian; we see numerous literary tropes identified in the same biblical texts and often the same or similar parallel passages are adduced for elaboration or corroboration. Regardless of how these traditions were transmitted, the vantage point of Adrian's *Introduction* affirms that Late Antique Christian biblical commentators shared an 'exegetical culture' which Martens identifies as the occurrence of 'similar, sometimes even identical interpretations of scriptural passages' shared by multiple authors from the same historical and geographical context.³⁹ This is an important finding because it testifies to a network in which learned paradigms were transmitted to sustain shared exegetical traditions. It also testifies to the emphasis on a particular set of priorities in biblical interpretation, which Martens rightly associates with the fourth and fifth-century Antiochene authors. What can be inferred about the kinds of questions that were being asked in order to produce such closely shared but flexible philological traditions, culminating in Adrian's *Introduction*?

2.2 *Antiochene and Alexandrian Reception of Greek Literary Criticism*

Greek grammatical study provided Antiochene authors with the tools to deal with the obscurity of the bible, especially the Old Testament, as a set of practical problems to be solved.⁴⁰ They shared and likely derived these tools from their Alexandrian predecessors. Via the Hexapla, Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea bestowed a legacy of hyperawareness over the difficulties in the grammar, language, and historical events of the Old Testament. Awareness of the translated character of the Old Testament formed a wrinkle without parallel in pagan authors.⁴¹ The move away from a kind of innocent view of the Septuagint as inspired translation was difficult to sustain, and so became an essential active ingredient—a question—in generating the grammatical-focused methods in Antiochene authors. Eusebius of Emesa, the teacher of Diodore and John Chrysostom (according to Jerome),⁴² made the important contribution of tackling such difficulties in the language of Genesis by referencing his *ad hoc* translations into Greek from his Syriac bible. Unlike Jerome whose later goal was really to 'heal' what was viewed as a broken Septuagint, Eusebius wished only to establish clarity. Eusebius of Emesa contextualizes the Antiochenes as inheritors of the legacy of Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea.

39 Martens, *Adrian's Introduction*, 16.

40 Here I paraphrase ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 94 n. 21.

41 Léonas, *Recherches*, 87–91.

42 See my discussion in Chapter 5.

From this vantage point emerges a set of priorities in their exegesis. As points on which to comment, they focused on narrative coherence, obscurities, historical facts (πράγματα), and Septuagint as translation; as methods by which to address these 'questions', they used paraphrase, *historia* as figure (identified by *e.g.* θεωρία and τύπος),⁴³ and Scripture clarifying itself.⁴⁴ Insofar as the above set of priorities characterizes Antiochene methodology broadly, this volume affirms John Chrysostom's place within it. However, he is noticeably more favorable at times towards *historia* as figure and uses the method of Scripture clarifying itself to stretch towards certain non-literal interpretations affirmed by Alexandrian authors and rejected by Antiochenes (see for instance Chapter 7). Breck has rightly emphasized that in light of Diodore's *Preface to the Psalms* where he articulates a theoretical stance on the 'hyperbolic' (καθ' ὑπερβολήν) character of Old Testament prophetic literature, Antiochene *theōria* invested *history itself* with a participatory symbolic character.⁴⁵ This implied that it was not the words themselves which contained the essential sense, but the events' capacity to contain a relation between the author's intention and the messianic accomplishment. But Chrysostom's difference to other Antiochenes lies primarily in his willingness to view entire passages as containing non-literal (usually Christological) referents based on linguistic clues just as much as on the *historia* of a narrative. But *how* he arrived at these decisions is telling, for he did so from within the web of certain text-referent traditions, resources shared with Alexandrians. These resources available to Chrysostom are just as important to mapping the choices that

43 A useful survey of scholarship on this term's importance for the Antiochene school is B. Nassif, "'Spiritual Exegesis' in the School of Antioch", in B. Nassif (ed.) *New Perspectives on Historical Theology. Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 343–377.

44 I rely on the working definition of the Antiochene school provided in R.B. ter Haar Romeny, 'Eusebius of Emesa's *Commentary on Genesis* and the Origins of the Antiochene School', in J. Frishman–L. Van Rompay, *The Book of genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation. A Collection of Essays*, TEG 5 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 125–142, esp. 128–129. The list, focused on the problem of translation as the fundamental 'question' from which emerges Antiochene methodology, is reinforced by Léonas, *Recherches*, 99. F.H. Chase, *Chrysostom: A Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation* (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, & Co., 1887), 48 held that Antiochene Biblical interpretation was related to the grand-narrative of the gradual education of the human race; as author of the Biblical text, the divine conditioned human, and therefore Biblical language so that it would not lose its essential characteristic of definite reference.

45 J. Breck, 'Theōria antiochienne et eschatologie «holistique»', in Stavrou–Van Rossum (dir.), *Écriture et tradition chez les Pères de l'église*, 55.

he makes; communicating to a mass-audience alone does not determine his exegesis and its noted preferences for literal commentary and moral *paraenesis*.

It is not as if Alexandrian authors in the wake of Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea such as Didymus and Cyril were ignorant of or in total disagreement with Antiochene exegetical concerns, making the dichotomy between Alexandrian and Antiochene authors problematic. This point has been salient since Guillet's classic article comparing the exegesis of Psalm 2 in Origen and Theodore, driven home more recently by Ondrey's contribution comparing Theodore and Cyril on the Minor Prophets.⁴⁶ She follows Martens, who has shown that Origen himself was concerned with establishing proper versus inappropriate non-literal exegesis, and that identification of ἀλληγορία and τύπος was but one among several literary techniques that *could* be applied to the biblical text if sufficiently warranted by philological connection.⁴⁷ This question of warrant is vital for the purposes of the present volume, which suggests that Chrysostom's non-literal readings were warranted by previous models which focused on name- and word-depth studies.

For Origen, Didymus, and Cyril, the problems of obscurity, narrative incoherence, and translation were deemed more edifying for the reader if solved with the systematic application of the rhetorical techniques of allegorical and typological interpretation in relation to various accents of a theology of the Scriptural *Logos* which included speculation or parallel narration regarding noetic and cosmic realities.⁴⁸ Such non-literal interpretations were identified, argued, and evaluated by the criterion of what was viewed as philological connection. In practice this was often the manipulation of a word or image

46 J. Guillet, 'Les exégèses d'Alexandrie et d'Antioche. Conflit ou Malentendu?', *RSR* 34:3 (1947), 257–302; H. Ondrey, *The Minor Prophets as Christian Scripture in the Commentaries of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Cyril of Alexandria*, OECs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

47 P.W. Martens, 'Revisiting the Allegory/Typology Distinction: The Case of Origen', *J ECS* 16.3 (2008), 296, 310–314.

48 H. de Lubac, *Histoire et esprit. L'intelligence de l'écriture d'après Origène*, Théologie 16 (Paris: Aubier, 1950); G. Bayliss, *The Vision of Didymus the Blind. A Fourth-Century Virtue-Origenism*, OTRM (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2015), 73, shows that Didymus could speak of 'the summary of Scripture [as] the citizenship of Christ' but also in the same passage that 'all Scripture is a book, whose heading is the goal for which the Scriptures have been given, namely salvation, the sojourning'. Bayliss also helpfully points out that Cyril, *Glaph. Gen.* 1 pro. (PG 69.13) could speak of Christ as the pearl hidden in the *whole* Scriptures. See the account of Cyril's combination of philological concerns with allegorical interpretation in D. Zaganas, *La formation d'une exégèse alexandrine post-origénienne*, TEG 17 (Leuven: Peeters, 2019).

to purvey multiple dimensions based on comparison with other contexts in which the same word or image appeared. Thus, the 'grammatical' reading is always, in principle, part of Alexandrian procedures, just as is the 'figurative'.⁴⁹ At some points, then, the introduction of the *Logos* itself or the noetic realm as subject / *skopos* seemed foreign to the context and sense of the passage at hand, connected tenuously to a mere word or two. Identifying Origen's biblical hermeneutics as his opponent at one point, Theodore insisted that this problem resembled a pagan method of myth interpretation that abolished the letter of the text and, most importantly, gave way for various heretical theologies such as Trinitarian subordinationism.⁵⁰ Theodore's expression is heavily determined by theological polemics; yet, along with Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa, he committed to non-literal readings at various points. His argument is best understood as the exposure of one perspective on how inter-Christian exegetical polemics were conducted, how non-literal readings were evaluated. It is essential to bear in mind that in this very passage where he inveighs against Origen's Biblical hermeneutics, Theodore positively received the Pauline term for allegory as applicable to 'all the books' (ܐܠܠ ܐܡܠܐ) of Scripture; from even the historical books, he says, one can pull great 'profit' (ܠܝܕܐܠ).⁵¹ Theodore's attack, then, shows that at stake was 'the way perceived meanings were taken to relate to the surface of the text',⁵² that is, the fundamental concern for an aesthetic judgment regarding the coherence between language and *skopoi*, word and meanings, with the latter determined by the exigencies of the interpreter's theological goals, exegetical resources, and contextual demands.

Central to this evaluation in practice was the problem of negotiating between multiple *skopoi* across the Bible, usually based on single books or clear *pericopae*. Young has already shown that Antiochenes appear to be more restrictive to the view that single books or *pericopae* imply single *skopos*, and this functioned as a firm criteria for their evaluation of non-literal readings.⁵³ As Martens suggests, the examination of *how* and, where possible, *why* particular interpreters viewed specific non-literal interpretations as successful will illuminate the historical features of early Christian exegetical culture and the underlying questions that generated different reading strategies.

49 Martens, 'Revisiting', 317; Ondrey, *The Minor Prophets*, 16.

50 Theodore, *Tr. c. all.* 3 (CSCO 189.8–24); see discussion in Ondrey, *The Minor Prophets*, 26–30, esp. 30 where it is pointed out that the anti-allegorical polemics of Eustathius and Theodore were, ultimately, driven by 'orthodox' theological concerns.

51 Theodore, *Tr. c. all.* 3 (CSCO 189.9.7–9).

52 F. Young, 'The Fourth Century Reaction Against Allegory', *StPatr* 30 (1997), 122.

53 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 183–184.

In this volume, I thereby retain the dichotomy between Alexandrian and Antiochene authors as an exploratory heuristic insofar as these designations refer not to 'equal but opposed schools'⁵⁴ but rather to the shifting tendencies to evaluate non-literal readings via a single-Christological-noetic-*skopos* versus multiple-psychological-historical-*skopoi* within a shared framework of awareness of rhetorical tools, philological techniques, and traditions of webbed text-referents. Chrysostom deftly navigated this shared framework as it suited his purposes, drawing on traditions of non-literal readings to establish mimetic and mnemonic values which lend cohesion to the graphic effect of his discourses.

2.3 Precision of Reference

The value of Adrian's *Introduction* is amplified when placed alongside a parallel development in contemporary research into patristic exegetical traditions. Correspondences of texts-referents could be conveyed with striking precision, suggesting the availability, circulation, and consultation of biblical commentaries or materials which signaled stock problems to be addressed and the techniques by which to do so. A breakthrough in this regard came from Petit's research in the Greek Genesis *catenae* and *Collectio Coisliniana* traditions.⁵⁵ She showed that at points, Diodore, John Chrysostom's teacher, copied the linguistic explanations based on the Syriac and Hebrew versions of the Old Testament found in his own teacher Eusebius of Emesa.⁵⁶ But not all cases permit such clear lines of transmission. Many exegetical traditions conveyed a general response framework but enabled considerable flexibility, making it difficult to discern precise sources. For instance, when faced with a strange line in the biblical text regarding the retribution awaiting Cain, Christian authors knew to reflect on his sins by enumerating them according to seven distinct cases. While some like Chrysostom applied the same terminology as others, Diodore seems to have innovated most of his list.⁵⁷ Another example emerges when Gen 6,6 says

54 Ondrey, *The Minor Prophets*, 16.

55 The *Collectio Coisliniana* is distinct from the *catenae* proper, and edited in F. Petit (ed.), *Catenae Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum. 11: Collectio Coisliniana*, CCSG 15 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1986); the *catenae* on Genesis are edited in *ibid.* (ed.), *La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Édition Intégrale* 1–4, TEG 1–4 (Leuven: Peeters, 1991–1996). See *ibid.*, 'La Chaîne grecque sur la Genèse miroir de l'exégèse ancienne', in Schöllgen–Scholten (eds.), *Stimuli*, 243–253 for an accessible presentation of the various author-groups within textual traditions and the utility and challenges in using *catenae* for patristic research.

56 These are studied in ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian* and discussed further in Chapters 4 and 5.

57 See Chapter 5 for detailed comparison of Origen, Acacius, Basil, Diodore, and John Chrysostom on this tradition.

that God ‘reconsidered’ the making of man. In face of this text, authors ranging from Origen to John Chrysostom discussed the issue of divine mutability, for this word seems to imply that the divine experienced the passion of anger.⁵⁸ Many of the authors working from this tradition used similar paraphrasing techniques to bring up other ways the term in question might be understood. But each author goes in a different direction with their precise take on the problem and how to address it.⁵⁹ Other traditions concerned the connection of multiple biblical texts. For instance, many authors knew that to explain the divine ‘breath’ instilled in the dust frame of the human being in Gen 2,7, reference to either Ps 118,73 or John 20,22 could enable further discussion about anthropological issues.⁶⁰ It is not always clear exactly how such traditions were transmitted. Two separate ways may be considered, that of direct transmission and that of exegetical school.

In her masterful account of patristic exegesis, Young helpfully reframed the fourth-century trinitarian controversies as ‘deductive’ battles fought on exegetical grounds.⁶¹ While Athanasius had debated the applicability of biblical texts to the *Logos* incarnate versus the *Logos* eternal,⁶² later pro-Nicene appeals to the σκοπός of the biblical text ‘focused around the creating and salvific activity of the distinct and yet intimately present Triune God.’⁶³ Pro-Nicene authors reasoned that Scripture was a system of signs corresponding to a progressive pedagogy, over which presided an incomprehensible God. Detailed studies have clarified how these convictions were practiced exegetically and transferred between authors. DelCogliano analyzed a text-referent tradition regarding the ‘spirit’ in Amos 4,13.⁶⁴ Since another verb in the text implies that this ‘spirit’ was created, Basil of Caesarea argued that the ‘spirit’ refers to the wind, not the Holy Spirit. Basil argues by referencing the participial form of the verb and comparing the situation with John 1,3, where for him the Holy Spirit is clearly excluded from the ‘all things’ of creation. These two strategies (and

58 Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 133–157. See Chapter 3 and Chapter 8 for further discussion.

59 See M. Harl, *La Genèse*, BA 1 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989), 127 and ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 254–258.

60 M.-O. Boulnois, ‘Le souffle et l’Esprit. Exégèses patristiques de l’insufflation originelle de Gn 2, 7 en lien avec celle de Jn 20, 22’, *Recherches Augustiniennes* 24 (1989), 3–37; see Chapter 8 for further discussion of these traditions.

61 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 40.

62 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 29–31.

63 L. Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy. An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 339.

64 M. DelCogliano, ‘Basil of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind, and the Anti-Pneumatomachian Exegesis of Amos 4:13 and John 1:3’, *JThS* 61.2 (2010), 644–658.

more) are found in Didymus's *On the Holy Spirit*, and not in other treatments of Amos 4,13 from contemporaries Athanasius and Eusebius of Caesarea who took the text with different referents. While it is not possible to say exactly how Basil received Didymus's take on this tradition, it was unlikely in an institutional setting such as a school and more likely a literary exchange or an ecclesial situation in which Didymus's work was published.

Yet our consideration of Genesis exegetical traditions above has suggested that Christian exegetical school environments resembling pagan philosophical or grammatical schools played some role in the creation and transmission of exegetical traditions—consider the systematic scale of Diodore's adaptation of Eusebius of Emesa.⁶⁵ However, the evidence for the specific activities of such schools and their role in biblical study in the fourth-century, the period in which Chrysostom worked, is slim. This may be because according to Jerome's testimony, much Scriptural instruction occurred privately during this time.⁶⁶ The pagan philosophical schools, based largely in exegesis, provide an important counterpoint to the cultural contexts which sustained the development of patristic exegetical traditions.

In an influential essay, Hadot proposed for Christian theology a *παλαιὸς λόγος* model based on the philosophical schools. Hadot studied ancient schools of philosophical exegesis and showed that by the third-century, Platonic and Aristotelian exegetes conceived of truth as given by the school-founder in an indistinct way, so the exegete must draw it out.⁶⁷ This model is not immediately transferrable to patristic exegetical traditions, which used grammatical techniques and webs of text-referent correspondences to revise and amplify previous attempts. Further, much patristic exegesis occurred in liturgical con-

65 H.-I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1948), 467–470 outlines the evidence from Eusebius's account of the second- and third-century schools of 'higher learning', with special attention to the first firm instance of a successive Christian catechetical school around Origen, for which see the indispensable study of A. van den Hoek, 'The "Catechetical" school of Early Christian Alexandria and its Philonic Heritage', *HTR* 90.1 (1997), 59–87. But Eusebius, on whom Marrou relies, does not envision the transmission of exegetical traditions specifically. From a few other ancient sources, we can speak of institutional schools in third and fourth-century C.E. Alexandria, Caesarea, Antioch and Nisibis. Polemical historiographers like the sixth-century Barhadbeshabba, *Causa*, PO 18.375.3 envisioned the apostles themselves opening these early catechetical schools with the distinct vision of expounding the scriptures (ܠܥܕܢܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ). He proceeds to explain each school according to a characteristic principle, such as Alexandrian allegory, but no specifics emerge.

66 So Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation*, 470.

67 P. Hadot, 'Théologie, exégèse, révélation, écriture dans la philosophie grecque', in *Les règles de l'interprétation* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1987), 22–23.

texts, such as homilies preceding the eucharist or celebration of a Christian festival, thus accounting for a different approach to ‘wisdom’ than what may be found in pagan philosophical models.⁶⁸

2.4 *Self-Awareness of Tradition*

Roughly contemporary with Adrian’s text, a final methodological development emerges. Patristic exegetes increasingly expressed direct indebtedness to previous models, in some cases suggesting a kind of research process that led them to the composition of their own works. Such mentions become more common in the fifth- and sixth-centuries around the growth of compilation commentary. Writing around the turning of the sixth-century, Procopius of Gaza prefaces his remarkable *Commentary on the Octateuch*: ‘Inasmuch as God has supplied the means of abundance, I previously gathered the explications (ἐξηγήσεις) of the Octateuch by the Fathers and others (ἐκ τῶν πατέρων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων), collecting them from commentaries (ἐξ ὑπομνημάτων) and various discourses ... I set out to reduce the composition to a convenient size’.⁶⁹ He seems to indicate a two-step procedure, that of the collecting of materials from previous exegetical authorities and the redaction of this assembly for a wieldier tome. He goes on to explain a principle of selection, whereby he reduced redundancies and brought to the fore differing perspectives—indeed, one of the most important features of Procopius’s *Commentary* is that it does not discernibly privilege figural or typological reading over linguistic and philological commentary. Procopius represents a highpoint of self-awareness in the development of patristic exegetical traditions and a case in which exegesis is highly dependent on previous Christian models, models taken from many genre forms.⁷⁰ But in the generation following John Chrysostom’s career, such self-awareness was already functioning in the composition of works of Biblical commentary. In his *Questions and Answers on Genesis*, Theodoret writes of ‘other learned men’ (ἄλλοι φιλομαθεῖς ἄνδρες) who treated ‘problems’ (ζητήματα) in the scriptures in the same way that he proposed to do.⁷¹ Theodoret is not as clear as Procopius that his proce-

68 W. Horbury, ‘Old Testament Interpretation in the Writings of the Church Fathers’, in J. Mulder–H. Sysling (eds.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity* (Assen–Philadelphia, PA: Van Gorcum–Fortress, 1988), 736–740.

69 Procopius of Gaza, *Ecl. Gen.* pro. 1–8 (GCS NF 22.1). I rely on the English translation found in R.A. Layton, ‘Moses the Pedagogue: Procopius, Philo, and Didymus on the Pedagogy of the Creation’, in L. Jenott–S.K. Gribetz (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Cosmogony in Late Antiquity*, TSAJ 155 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 173–174.

70 See the survey of the sources in Metzler, *Prokop von Gaza*, XC–CXXVI.

71 Theodoret, *Q. Gen.* pro. 1–2 (LEC 1.2).

ture is directly based on the works of the 'others', but Guinot has shown that it bears many resemblances to the works of Diodore and John Chrysostom.⁷² The examples of how Procopius and Theodoret postured themselves in their prologues are milestones in the development of Christian authors articulating indebtedness to their sources as part of their procedure. For our contextualization of John Chrysostom's work, Theodoret's case raises the question-and-answer as a fundamental device propelling both his own work and that of his predecessors.

3 Questions-and-Answers and Genesis Exegesis

Patristic biblical exegesis flourished by recovering the genre and the literary format of questions-and-answers.⁷³ Concerning the former, *Erotapokriseis* was a popular genre choice for instruction in ancient literary criticism, medicine, law, and philosophy, and was adopted at an early point by Christians for instruction.⁷⁴ By the mid-sixth-century, there was a proliferation of these texts in

72 J.-N. Guinot, *L'exégèse de Théodoret de Cyr*, ThHist 100 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1995), 748–797.

73 I rely on the distinction proposed by C. Zamagni, 'Is the Question-and-Answer Literary Genre in Early Christian Literature a Homogeneous Group?', in M.-P. Bussi  res (ed.), *La litt  rature des questions et r  ponses dans l'Antiquit   profane et chr  tienne*, IPM 64 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 242: 'Genre, which refers to literary works composed exclusively of questions and answers, with an introduction and a conclusion ... literary format, a question-and-answer pattern, used in a work visibly pertaining to another definite genre, as a commentary or an epistle.' I view the Christian use of the genre and format of questions-and-answers as a 'recovery' (*r  prise*) of a well-established pattern of argumentation, explained in C. Zamagni, 'Porphyre est-il la cible principale des «questions» chr  tiennes des IV   et V   si  cles?', in S. Morlet (ed.), *Le trait   de Porphyre contre les Chr  tiens. Un si  cle de recherches, Nouvelles questions. Actes du colloque international organis   les 8 et 9 septembre 2009    l'Universit   de Paris IV-Sorbonne*, EAA 190 (Paris: Institut d'Etudes Augustiniennes, 2011), 359.

74 Aristotle's list of 'problems' (  ροβλήματα) in the *Poetics* 25 is illuminating for the kinds of questions with which literary critical works composed in Late Antiquity dealt: elements not true to life, irrationality, moral harm, inconsistent or contradictory passages, and violations of aesthetic art. For discussion of this passage and his lost work *Homeric Problems*, see H. Hintenland, *Untersuchungen zu den Homer-aporien des Aristoteles* (Diss. Heidelberg, 1961), and for ancient works based on it, see A. Gudemann, '  ύσεις', RE 13.2 (1927), 2511–2514. In Late Antique philosophy, there is the example of Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Quaestiones* (CAG 2/2), with helpful discussion in E.S. Forster, 'The Pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems*: Their Nature and Composition' CQ 22.3–4 (1928), 163–165; A. Gr  fenhan, *Geschichte der klassischen Philologie im Alterthum*, 111. Band (Bonn: K  nig, 1846), 231–232 surveys use of the genre in medicine.

For greater critical acumen regarding the distinction between genre and format, the article of Zamagni, 'Question-And-Answer' should be viewed as indispensable next to the

Christian circles, useful for instruction in key points of theology, philosophy, biblical exegesis, and religious practice. The *Erotopokriseis* of pseudo-Kaisarios is a well-known example. This text of hundreds of questions-and-answers is organized by a continuous dialogue between author/pupil and audience/student on select important issues in Christian theology. Exegesis of the bible further characterizes much of the procedure. As Papadogiannakis explains, 'Each of these [biblical] passages raise an issue, tests the author's ability to reason deeply and closely on restricted samples of text and provides him with the opportunity to unlock their spiritual dimension. His responses often result in elaborate expositions of doctrine in which different proofs from the Bible [...] are used to illuminate opaque or discrepant passages and are intertwined to produce a richly textured reply infused with the language of spiritual direction'.⁷⁵ Instruction may have prepared the audience to respond to polemical situations, such as trinitarian conflicts, Hellenistic cosmology, or the punishment of the Jews—in short, the encyclopedic outline of an orthodox theology.⁷⁶ Despite an apologetic appearance, however, there is little evidence that these texts were used in apologetic contexts.⁷⁷ The dialogic rhetorical format of these texts simulates the experience of a teacher in a classroom. In pseudo-Kaisarios, exegesis, question-and-answer and dialogue come together. The inquirer 'asks the teacher to provide them with sound instruction in various *kephalaia* of the bible lest they are misled by the fools'.⁷⁸ The organizing principle of pseudo-Kaisarios, like the other *Erotopokriseis* Greek Christian literature of the time, is doctrinal, philosophical, and theological. Biblical commentaries, on the other hand, were of course organized according to the biblical text.

Yet it is important to note that patristic biblical commentaries often utilized in some way the format of questions-and-answers, that is, the pattern of posing questions following selections of text, and offering solutions as guiding

classic survey of G. Bardy 'La littérature patristique des «quaestiones et responsiones» sur l'Écriture sainte', *RB* 41 (1932) 210–236, 341–369, 515–537; 42 (1933) 14–30, 211–229, 328–352. The latter retains great utility as its scope is wider, but precisely in this it is problematic for purposes of classification.

75 Y. Papadogiannakis, 'Didacticism, Exegesis, and Polemics in pseudo-Kaisarios's *erotapokriseis*', in Bussi eres (ed.), *La litt erature*, 279.

76 Ibid., 'Encyclopedism' in the Byzantine question-and-answer literature—the case of Pseudo-Kaisarios', in P. Van Deun–C. Mac  , *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium? Proceedings of the International Conference held in Leuven, 6–8 May 2009*, OLA 212 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 29–44.

77 Zamagni, 'Porphyre est-il la cible', 367–369.

78 Y. Papadogiannakis, 'Instruction by Question and Answer: The Case of Late Antique and Byzantine *Erotopokriseis*', in S.F. Johnson (ed.), *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity. Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2006), 96.

the commentary, or at least a part of it. As already noted, we have texts such as Theodoret's *Questions and Answers on Genesis* which proceed explicitly by question-and-answer, and so may be said to be within the *genre* of *Erotopokriseis*. But there are several cases in which patristic biblical commentaries blur the lines between format and genre. Jerome's *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* is a classic example, as Kamesar has shown.⁷⁹ In this case, even though there are very few actual questions posed, the scholia-like comments are arranged as if they are answers to philological-based questions (there is, of course, much theological concern in the work) posed to the text of Genesis—precisely what Schäublin had pointed out, perhaps prematurely, in regard to the form of Diodore's commentary.⁸⁰ Ter Haar Romeny views a similar format for the *Commentary on Genesis* of Eusebius of Emesa, and agrees with Kamesar that in these cases the use of the genre of questions-and-answers is not disturbed by the absence of a rigid form: Eusebius's *Commentary* proceeds by 'hidden ζητήματα', well-known enough for his audience or inferred from the way Eusebius constructs his comments.⁸¹ Zamagni might dispute whether the works of Jerome and Eusebius of Emesa should be included in the *genre* of questions-and-responses,⁸² but it is undeniable that there is a relation; it is likely safest to say with ter Haar Romeny that these are evolutions based on the common or presumed knowledge of the question. The richly surviving Genesis exegetical tradition thereby recommends itself for the clarification of how genres of exegesis, in tandem with the content of their questions, evolved across early Christian authors.

The phenomenon of the elided question enabled authorial ingenuity in relation to previous traditions. Like questions-and-answers literature, biblical commentaries often recycled questions and adapted them to new formats.⁸³ It also happens that similar but related questions are treated, indicating common knowledge of passages that need commentary and a flexible range of expectations for treating it. A famous example will suffice to illustrate. In his *Commentary on Genesis*, Eusebius of Emesa points out that the Greek word in Gen 1,2 for the spirit 'hovering' above the waters has a fuller sense in Hebrew, meaning something closer to a bird 'covering' her nest. Eusebius presents various

79 A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*, Oxford Classical Monographs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).

80 Schäublin, *Untersuchungen*, 49–65.

81 Ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 12–13.

82 Zamagni, 'Questions-and-Answer', 249.

83 L. Perrone, 'Sulla preistoria della «quaestiones» nella letteratura patristica. Presupposti e sviluppi del genere letterario fino al IV sec', *ASE* 8/2 (1991), 486–487; Zamagni, 'Questions-and-Answer', 264.

options for the identity of the ‘spirit’ referent of this verb, such as the air or the Holy Spirit.⁸⁴ In his *Hebrew Questions on Genesis*, Jerome knows a similar web of text-technique-referent, but he approaches it more directly through supplying the actual Hebrew word. He affirms the Holy Spirit interpretation, being more definite than Eusebius and resembling Basil of Caesarea’s *Homily 2 on the Hexaemeron* in this regard.⁸⁵ In his *Questions on Genesis*, Theodoret does not cite the Semitic language or the image of the bird ‘covering’ the waters, but does discuss at length the question ‘Which spirit ‘moved the waters,’’ and includes the options of either the air or the Holy Spirit.⁸⁶ How do we best explain such common knowledge? It is likely too optimistic to suggest a single common source, though the explanation likely originated with Eusebius of Emesa. But what accounts for the differences between the commentators? Clearly, the three were exposed to a scholastic context which conveyed, through written or oral form, the knowledge of both a general question or set of questions and possible answers and techniques that could be applied to this text, such as that witnessed in Theodoret (‘Which spirit?’ ‘What is the meaning of “hovering”’?—Answer: The air). Patristic exegetical traditions were transmitted roughly or precisely according to question-and-answer, with the expectation that previous models may be revised across different literary genres and contextual applications.

Can more be said about the precise social contexts in which these questions were generated, and their answers worked out? The work of Origen provides an important point from which to view the fluidity of questions-and-answers in early Christianity. Perrone’s important article on the prehistory to the proliferation of questions-and-answers (genre) works in the fifth- and sixth-centuries suggests that a ‘zetetic’ method plays a significant role in his commentaries and more systematic works (such as *On First Principles*). Viciano ties together the threads:

An die Bibel werden nämlich nicht immer Fragen κατὰ φιλομάθειαν, sondern auch κατὰ φιλονεικίαν ζητῶν gestellt, was eine apologetische Exegese fordert. Perrone schließt, daß diese Haltung des Origenes im Mittelpunkt der „Vorgeschichte“ der *quaestiones* steht, die sich dann im 4. Jh. und den weiteren Jahrhunderten weiterentwickelten. Die Angriffe von Porphyrius gegen die Christen und die katechetische Praxis, die in Form von Fragen

84 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 5a–b (TEG 15.32).

85 Jerome, *Heb. Q. Gen.* 1,2 (Hayward 30); Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 2.6 (GCS NF 2.31,10–22).

86 Theodoret, *Q. Gen.* 8,1 (LEC 1.24): Ποῖον πνεῦμα ... ἐπεφέρετο.

und Antworten gestaltet war, sind Faktoren verschiedener Herkunft, die ihre Spuren in dieser Gattung hinterlassen haben.⁸⁷

Viciano is right to explain the development of Christian exegesis by questions-and-answers as somehow related to criticisms from pagan sources. Chase had made a similar assumption about Diodore, John Chrysostom's teacher, understanding his hermeneutical statements as directed against Julian—the apologist becomes the interpreter, he quips.⁸⁸ But such formulations are potentially misleading: Porphyry, as referenced by Viciano, is only seldomly found as the direct source for problems which are treated in Christian questions-and-answers literature, such as Eusebius of Caesarea's *Question 13 to Stephen*; to Chase, little is known of Julian and Diodore's historical contact.⁸⁹ Following scholars such as Courcelle and Rinaldi, Neuschäfer too had suggested that the 'zetetic' method of Origen was principally for dealing with heretical interpretations.⁹⁰ But these scholars relied on the tacit assumption that questions-and-answers with apologetic tone indicate an apologetic context for the production or use of the literature at hand. The situation is likely more complicated than this, for we have seen that many aspects of patristic exegetical tradition developed according to internal debate and revision. In a further study, Perrone revisited Origen's role and showed that the literary format of questions-and-answers also belonged to his homilies with similar double-results, apologetic and philological.⁹¹ This finding makes the issue of context all the more important yet all the more difficult to reconstruct. The homily contains many other

87 Viciano, 'Das formale Verfahren', 394: "To the Bible is not always posed questions "according to the philologist", but rather also "questioning according to the controversialist", which requires an apologetic exegesis. Perrone concludes that this position of Origen stands at the midpoint of the "prehistory" of the *quaestiones*, which then further developed in the fourth-century and following. Porphyry's attack against the Christians, and the catechetical practice which was set out in the form of questions-and-answers, are both factors from different origins, and they have left their marks in this genre'.

88 Chase, *Chrysostom*, 9–11.

89 Zamagni, 'Porphyre est-il la cible', 366.

90 Neuschäfer, *Origenes as Philologe*, 1:32. P. Courcelle, 'Critiques exégétiques et arguments antichrétiens rapportés par Ambrosiaster', *VC* 13.3 (1959), 133–169; G. Rinaldi, 'Tracce di controversie tra pagani e cristiani nella letteratura patristica delle 'quaestiones et responsiones'', *ASE* 6 (1989) 99–124. Whereas Courcelle presumed the apologetic context based on the tone and style of some of Ambrosiaster's *quaestiones*, Rinaldi showed that texts such as the pseudo-Justin *Questions and responses to the orthodox* raise questions and problems on the bible that are found in Porphyry, Celsus, and Julian.

91 L. Perrone, 'Perspectives sur Origène et la littérature patristique des «questiones et responsiones», in Alexandre et al. (eds.), *Origeniana sexta*, 151–164.

elements alongside the philological and apologetic aspects brought out in dealing with difficulties in the scriptures. Liturgical context and audience composition are crucial, but elusive. This is especially the case for John Chrysostom's works after Mayer's deconstruction of our assumptions about provenance and her call for case-by-case analysis on the basis of internal criteria. As Broc-Schmezer points out, the viewing of Chrysostom's biblical homilies as 'systematic' is problematic, even though at points he treats the text on a verse-by-verse basis.⁹² Cook, further, demonstrated that Chrysostom's harsh rhetoric may not owe to a specific audience but a more general scholastic environment. That being said, the matter of apologetic context and traditions of exegesis related to question-and-answer may be explored by focusing on early Christian commentary on the book of Genesis, from which John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* emerge as an important witness, blending multiple contexts.

The book of Genesis was realized for its potential to support the universalizing Christian message. As Bucur's important work on theophanic exegesis has shown, Abrahamic episodes were the site of theophanic exegetical traditions, a distinct hermeneutical development within patristic authors that 're-visioned' the Old Testament, and so the history of Israel, as possessing the mysterious presence of Christ.⁹³ The sheer amount of Christian commentaries and works devoted to Genesis exegesis indicates the book's importance, and certain sections seem to have attracted more attention than others, such as the binding of Isaac (Gen 22) or the six-day creation account (Gen 1–3).⁹⁴ This may be due, as Viciano rightly suggests, to the works of erudite and eloquent pagan critics from the third- and fourth-centuries, Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian. In their literary attacks on Christianity, they included formal skepticism concerning Old Testament books, Genesis chief among them.⁹⁵ At points

92 C. Broc-Schmezer, 'Théologie et philosophie en prédication: le cas de Jean Chrysostome', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 97 (2013), 197.

93 Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned*, 42–70.

94 For commentaries on Genesis, see the overview in the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*; for the *hexaemeron*, Y. Congar, 'Le thème de Dieu-Créateur et les explications de l'Hexaemeron dans la tradition chrétienne', in *L'Homme devant Dieu. Mélanges offerts au Père Henri de Lubac*, *Théologie* 56 (Paris: Aubier, 1963), 215–222.

95 P. van der Horst, 'The Pagan Opponents of Christianity on the Book of Genesis', *VC* 72.3 (2018), 318–336 is a recent, useful introduction. Especially with Porphyry, van der Horst emphasizes the Jewish angle of the critiques, such as the claim that the Christians are zealous for Jewish myths. This article is to be used with caution, however. The contributions of S. Morlet, 'Un nouveau témoignage sur le *Contra Christianos* de Porphyre', *Semitica et Classica* 1 (2008), 157–166 and R. Goulet, 'Cinq nouveaux fragments nominaux du traité de Porphyry "Contre les chrétiens"', *VC* 64.2 (2010), 140–159, none of which are addressed in van der Horst's study, have shown that later witnesses to Porphyry's fragments are

they drew upon critiques of the Old Testament that occur also within early Christian disputes, such as Marcion's understanding of the biblical language regarding the divine 'spirit'⁹⁶ or Celsus's controversial claim that the bible was full of 'empty myths' that were not worth of 'receiving allegory'.⁹⁷ Morlet's detailed analysis has shown that Porphyry's criticism of the prohibition to eat from the tree of knowledge of good and evil (Gen 2,17) relates closely to that testified in the *Syllogisms* of Apelles (a disciple of Marcion). The *Syllogisms* were formulated as 'problems' (ἀπορίαι).⁹⁸ Concomitantly, many Christian exegetical, apologetic, and homiletic works deal with the Apelles-Porphyry criticism of this text, such as John Chrysostom's *Homilies 14–17 on Genesis*. But the exact connections between the literature remains elusive, as the formulation of the problems and their solutions vary. From this vantage point, pagan criticism may be said to relate to but not necessarily determine patristic exegetical questions-and-answers. Thome's important contribution to the study of Antiochene exegesis must be mentioned in this connection.⁹⁹ While it shows many parallels between Diodore, Theodore, and the Emperor Julian regarding hermeneutical debates, some specific to Genesis-exegesis (especially from the *Collectio Coisliniana*), there is no definitive connection that Antiochene anti-

not always reliable for reconstructing his exact arguments. But many of these fragments are included in the new edition of Matthias Becker (ed.), *Porphyrios, Contra Christianos. Neue Sammlung der Fragmente, Testimonien und Dubia mit Einleitung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, TU 52 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016). Van der Horst relies on this edition without discussion of its inherent problems, particularly regarding Porphyry's treatment of Genesis.

- 96 J.G. Cook, *The Interpretation of the Old Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*, STAC 23 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 57; 81–82: in reference to the 'spirit' mentioned in texts like Gen 1,2 and Gen 6,3, Celsus sees the supreme god, 'the stranger', demanding his spirit back. Irenaeus uses this terminology in posing a 'question' to Marcion.
- 97 Origen, *Cels.* 1.20 (SVC 54.22.9–13): μῦθοι κενοί ... μηδ' ἀλληγορίαν ἐπιδεχόμενοι. J. Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie. Les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes* (Paris: Aubier, 1958), 97–98, discusses the ancient testimony that mentions Theagenes of Rhegium as the originator of Homeric allegory, which Porphyry took to be a defense of the poet's theology against those who repudiated the literal sense of the text. Origen rigorously showed that the words of the bible referenced a credible conception of the divinity beyond that which the plain sense of the words conveyed. Allegory thereby enabled him to defend the plain sense of the Genesis text, as emphasized by G. Dorival, 'Le sens de l'écriture chez les Pères grecs', *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* 12 (1992), 436.
- 98 S. Morlet, 'Pourquoi Dieu a-t-il interdit la connaissance du bien et du mal? La critique porphyrienne de Gn 2,17: le problème de ses sources et de sa postérité', *Semítica et Classica* 4 (2011) 125–146.
- 99 F. Thome, *Historia contra mythos. Die Schriftauslegung Diodors von Tarsus und Theodors von Mopsuestia im Widerstreit zu Kaiser Julians und Salustius' allegorischen Mythenverständnis*, Hereditas 24 (Bonn: Borengässer, 2004).

allegorical polemics were directed primarily against Julian. Yet the Emperor's involvement in the fray must be at least paralleled to the development of patristic exegetical traditions.

Julian's knowledge of Genesis exegetical traditions was considerable, almost certainly filtered through impressive resources such as Origen's *Against Celsus*, but by no means limited thereto.¹⁰⁰ In his own *Against the Galileans*, he visited key themes such as the envious creator,¹⁰¹ the lunacy of Christian supersessionism, and the philosophically crude account of causation given in the book of Genesis.¹⁰² Indeed, regarding the book of Genesis, he could strike at detailed textual points. Patterns of prophetic and Christological text-referents were especially vulnerable. One such attack envisioned the famous proof text, Gen 49,10, which Julian denied as referring to the son of Mary.¹⁰³ Actually, the patristic exegetical tradition was inconsistent on this matter: while Eusebius of Caesarea and John Chrysostom affirmed the prophetic reference, Chrysostom's teachers Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore flatly denied it.¹⁰⁴ Does this tell us that apologetic concerns determined Eusebius of Caesarea and John Chrysostom's choices, whereas Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa were ignorant of Julian's assertion and thus contented with their exposition of the philological and historical context of the passage? Whatever the exact contextual aim of these works, it is clear that patristic exegetical traditions of questions-and-answer and pagan criticism interpenetrated to some degree, and that case-by-case analysis is the most reliable means to make conclusions about possible direct relations. Another finding from this consideration is that patristic exegetes freely operated within the cache of traditions to form their own responses to context and revisions of previous models. This raises the importance of homilies for filling out our understanding of the development of patristic exegetical traditions, and it was observed that works of Genesis, and John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* within them, provide an ideal test-case for exploring further the webs of questions-and-answer instruction in early Christianity.

100 M.-O. Boulnois, 'Le *Contre les Galiléens* de l'empereur Julien répond-t-il au *Contre Celse* d'Origène?', *REAug supp.* 3 (2014), 106–107.

101 Julian, *C. Gal.* fr. 17 [Mas.] *apud* Cyril of Alexandria, *C. Jul.* 3.29.5–22 (GCS NF 20.207–209): 'God is full of envy and spite' ([ὁ θεὸς] φθονεροῦ καὶ βασκάνου λίαν ἐστίν).

102 Ch. Riedweg, 'Julians Exegese der Rede des Demiurgen an die versammelten Götter in Platons Timaios 41 A–D: Anmerkungen zu Contra Galilaeos fr. 10 Mas', in D. Auger–É. Wolff (eds.), *Culture classique et christianisme: Mélanges offerts à Jean Bouffartigue* (Paris, 2008), 83–95.

103 Cook, *Interpretation*, 282.

104 See Chapter 7.1.2.

4 Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* and Patristic Exegetical Traditions

Amirav's important work on John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* already deepened our understanding of the questions-and-answers exposition as an adaptable, unifying basis of diverse literary genres.¹⁰⁵ She showed that Chrysostom linked closely the liturgical context, audience exhortations, and questions posed to the text of Genesis regarding narrative coherence and consistency. In the face of texts that on the surface have little to say for shaping his audience's Christian identity, questions that relate to previous exegetical models provided a creative cache from which to draw out a moral exposition. An excellent example is Chrysostom's handling of numbers in the text of Genesis. Noah is said to attain 500 years of age (Gen 5,32); Noah is said to have three sons (Gen 6,10); God instructs Noah to arrange the animals in pairs or groups of seven depending on their purity status (Gen 7,2).¹⁰⁶ The last of these, Amirav shows, is identified explicitly as a 'question' (ζήτημα): how could Noah discern pure versus impure animals when the Mosaic law was still forthcoming—a scholarly concern for narrative coherence found in previous authors.¹⁰⁷ Most importantly, however, Amirav demonstrates the connection of such exegetical questions to Chrysostom's wider aim in this particular discourse, what she aptly calls an 'exegetical compound'. Noah's begetting children at so late an age is, for example, a shining case of chastity and restraint.¹⁰⁸ Amirav's *Rhetoric and Tradition* therefore opens the door for a full-scale investigation of Chrysostom's standing in the tradition of patristic exegesis that had at its core questions-and-answers.

Yet perhaps it is because the homily does not strictly belong to either question-and-answer or biblical commentary that John Chrysostom's works, which form an enormous portion of the surviving literature dealing with the bible from antiquity, are often relegated to a form of lesser maturity in their handling of exegesis. Works stemming from the influence of the Second Sophistic often appear to use question-and-answer as artificial amplification of their own view, a kind of residue of the diatribe format.¹⁰⁹ Thus a dichotomy between

105 Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 46.

106 Ibid., 189–194.

107 Ibid., 205. I return to this question in Chapter 4.

108 Ibid., 196.

109 L. Méridier, *L'influence de la seconde sophistique sur l'œuvre de Grégoire de Nysse* (Paris: Hachette, 1906), 194–195: 'Quelquefois aussi, cette dialectique de parade se présente dans l'œuvre de Grégoire sous le prétexte d'un commentaire. Mais on s'aperçoit vite que les

the scholastic and the rhetorical often appears in resources accounting for John Chrysostom's work in the wider context of early Christian biblical instruction.¹¹⁰ When establishing his conception of an Antiochene exegetical culture and its fundamental techniques, Martens almost entirely excludes John Chrysostom. Adrian's *Introduction* was 'designed for classroom use',¹¹¹ Martens argues. A key characteristic of this exegetical culture is the use of problems and solutions, questions-and-answers, signaled by technical terminology (e.g. ζήτημα, λύσις). Chrysostom is neglected from the list of his contemporaries who used this approach.¹¹² Similarly, in his landmark study of Antiochene exegesis, Schäublin influentially demonstrated that Antiochene exegetes shared the zetetic model with pagan contemporaries such as Porphyry. Focusing almost exclusively on Diodore and Theodore, Schäublin adduces Chrysostom in only one instance,¹¹³ leaving the impression that as a preacher, he does not belong or participates seldomly in the exegetical environment inhabited by those who wrote formal biblical commentary. The case of Hill, the translator of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* and many other patristic works of Old Testament exegesis, is more complicated. Of course, at numerous points he treats Chrysostom in his synthetic account of Antiochene exegesis of the Old Testament. Yet while Chrysostom is among their number as a reader of the Old Testament, he is hardly among their learning as a scholarly exegete. Diodore and Theodoret can deal with rigorous scholarly matters, but Chrysostom is 'still naïve' even when making exhortations to study the text.¹¹⁴ The imbalance is seen also in the recent monograph of Cook, who understands Chrysostom's adaptation of the

considérations dont elle se recouvre sont étrangères au sujet traité ... Il greffe sur le texte de l'Écriture, en guise de commentaire, une sorte de long réquisitoire.' This judgment is echoed in Bardy, 'La littérature patristique', 226, where questions-and-answers are simply a literary procedure taken over from the rhetorical schools.

110 See the illuminating discussion of Simonetti's distinction between emotions (homilies) versus intelligence (commentary) in P. Rousseau, 'Homily and Exegesis in the Patristic Age: Comparisons of Purpose and Effect', in A.J. Quiroga Puertas (ed.), *The Purpose of Rhetoric in Antiquity. From Performance to Exegesis*, STAC 72 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), esp. 14–16. In Ch. Kannengiesser, *A Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, vol. 1, BAC 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 783, Chrysostom is included as an Antiochene exegete. But the *Handbook* comprehends his biblical hermeneutics by reiterating one of Quasten's generic statements about Chrysostom's literalism and lucid exposition of the bible, giving the impression that there is no connection between his exegesis and his rhetorical art.

111 Martens, *Adrian's Introduction*, 41.

112 Further, Chrysostom rarely surfaces in the parallels that Martens makes to other Antiochene authors.

113 Schäublin, *Untersuchungen*, 108.

114 Ch. Hill, *Reading the Old Testament in Antioch*, BAC 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 153.

Late Antique 'school' environment as primarily focused on the ethical meaning derived from the historical facts around the text.¹¹⁵

Aspects of this picture are warranted. For instance, in his *Homilies on Genesis*, John Chrysostom could respond to a particular scriptural problem by stating that it exceeds human comprehension, seeming to demur from giving a real answer.¹¹⁶ But the dichotomy of the scholastic and the rhetorical is difficult to sustain. In his *Homilies on Genesis*, he frequently calls for his audience's careful attention to study or search the text along with him in order to find the answer to an 'urgent question: which covers things hidden in the depths',¹¹⁷ or a 'problem [ζήτημα] that many are talking about.'¹¹⁸ At many points he displays precise or similar knowledge of the problem at hand as witnessed in his contemporaries and predecessors.¹¹⁹ While Cook is right to follow Young in treating Chrysostom as not primarily concerned with what Quintilian called τὸ μεθοδικόν, Chrysostom's indebtedness to patristic exegetical traditions related to questions-and-answers brings him to integrate aspects of ἐξήγησις. As Viciano had already shown in synthesizing the work of Dumortier, Pépin, and Astruc-Morize, John Chrysostom's homilies contain basic elements of exegesis within biblical commentary: anti-heretic directions, dogmatic questions (albeit addressed on a catechetical level), limited allegorical interpretation, concern for narrative coherence, and philological concern such as the 'habit' of scripture or the meaning of names.¹²⁰ Molinié has pointed out that the boundaries between homily and commentary are even more porous than previous classifications have allowed. Favor for the homiletic-commentary form was widespread across various 4th- and 5th-century authors and at the same time, the addressing of moral *paraenesis* is frequently found in the pages of what might be considered 'pure' commentary.¹²¹

115 Cook, *Preaching*, 61.

116 E.g., John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 11.1 (PG 53.92): 'What kind of human reasoning is able to understand this?' (ποῖος ἀνθρώπινος λογισμὸς δύναται τὰυτα κατιδεῖν;) See further discussion in Chapter 2.

117 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 18.3 (PG 53.151): 'It is necessary to search out with accuracy what is said, so that we might not leave behind the things hidden in this depth' (δεῖ γὰρ μετὰ ἀκριβείας διερευνῆσαι τὸ εἰρημένον, ἵνα μηδὲν ἡμᾶς λαθεῖν δυνήθῃ τῶν ἐν τῷ βάθει τοῦτῳ κεκρυμμένων).

118 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 28.4 (PG 53.257). See further discussion in Chapter 3.

119 See Appendix 1 for a list of 'problems' addressed in the *Homilies on Genesis* and their parallels to other sources.

120 Viciano, 'Das formale Verfahren', 393–394. I study these philological aspects further in Chapter 3.

121 P. Molinié, *Jean Chrysostome exégète. Le commentaire homilétique de la Deuxième épître de Paul aux Corinthiens*, OCA 305 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2019), 136–154.

Indeed, Chrysostom himself seems to envision his work as a contiguous commentary, for as he memorably expresses it in the introduction to his *Homily 36 on Genesis*, the treasure found in the teaching of ‘today’ is a ‘golden chain’ (σειράν τινα χρυσήν) connecting it with the previous *hypothesis*.¹²² It is unlikely that Chrysostom here expressed his commitment to a systematic commentary on the entirety of Genesis. Rather, this *catena*-like description likely refers to his teaching on the Abram cycle, which fits a pattern of envisaging major biblical episodes as distinct units, such as when he refers to the ‘end of the plan’ (τὸ τέλος τῆς ὑποθέσεως) on Noah.¹²³ Crépey showed that his *Homilies on Genesis* are structured according to a loose, uneven line-by-line approach, suggesting that they should be ranged in relation to biblical commentary, as Hill and Viciano recognized but did not explain.¹²⁴ The present volume goes a step further, adding that the use of questions-and-answers regarding scriptural problems is an essential dimension that accounts for Chrysostom’s place in patristic exegetical traditions, and, following Amirav, showing how a range of precision regarding knowledge of these ‘scholarly’ elements integrates around his wider rhetorical aims.

The questions-and-answers approach shows that John Chrysostom’s homilies are best understood as harnessing the dynamic of exegetical traditions for the purposes of his own staged dialogue with the audience, for it is often to the audience or in the position of an imagined interlocutor that he poses questions. Dialogue, however, is a problematic term. Cunningham has pointed out how some Byzantine homiletics skillfully employ the *mise-en-scène* of dialogue between various figures: Christ and Mary (or Martha), or the preacher and Mary’s parents, Joachim and Anna. The goal, Cunningham writes, is to ‘emphasize the eternal message of their sermons,’ by collapsing the distance between the text-world and the audience-world.¹²⁵ Bady has shown that Chrysostom made much of God as a character dialoguing with humanity, an image turned

122 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 36.1 (PG 53.332).

123 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 29.1 (PG 53.260).

124 Crépey, ‘Les Homélies’, 76; for R.C. Hill, ‘Chrysostom as Old Testament Commentator’, *Prudentia* 20.1 (1988), 44, the *Homilies on Genesis* are merely ‘exegetical homilies’ but he does not explain what this means; Viciano, ‘Das formale Verfahren’, 392 supports this impression but purveys some the confusion over how to classify Chrysostom’s works. A notable exception to Chrysostom’s line-by-line approach in the *Homilies on Genesis* is the omission of the episode of the alliance between Abimelech and Abraham (Gen 21.22–34).

125 M.B. Cunningham, ‘Dramatic Device or Rhetorical Tool? The Function of Dialogue in Byzantine Preaching,’ in E. Jeffreys (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium. Papers from the Thirty-Fifth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Exeter College, University of Oxford, March 2001* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2003), 105–107, here 107.

for the profit of exhorting his audience to ‘dialogue’ or ‘address oneself’ to heretics against their views.¹²⁶ Notwithstanding the ubiquity of the term in Chrysostom’s works, the latter is particularly important for our purposes, as it draws out the moments in which Chrysostom transfers the expectation to teach from himself onto his audience. An example from the *Homilies on Genesis* illustrates this well: ‘Argue the point in correspondence [καταλλήλως διαλεγόμενοι] with the Jews, showing them the words [of Gen 1,26] have reference not to some one of the ministering powers’.¹²⁷ Yet this cannot be taken to mean that Chrysostom was encouraging his audience to emulate what we might take to mean civil and democratic ideals; he did not intend his audience to open their minds to what Jews had to say, but rather address their assertions about the meaning of Gen 1,26 point-for-point using the teaching he provided. Sandwell has thus called into question the utility of ‘dialogue’ as a category for understanding John Chrysostom’s hermeneutical art. Chrysostom’s goals, she suggests, are manifestly not to include the opinion of others in a way that enables his audience to choose among options or connect with their prior cognitive models. We may more usefully understand Chrysostom’s engagement with his audience as mass-communication intending to form jarringly new conceptions in relation to previous cultural models.¹²⁸ And he struggled to teach Genesis in particular, Sandwell argues, because he lacked a solid grasp on pedagogical resources that would enable elementary comprehension to improve. His dealing with anything close to scholarly matters is an attempt to accommodate to the lowest common denominator, but this often precludes meaningful engagement; a search for control over the bible’s correct interpretation characterizes his approach.¹²⁹ To this view may be added the moderate estimation of Broc-Schmezer, who judges that Chrysostom’s exegetical work proceeds

126 G. Bady, ‘«Allons et discutons»: le dialogue avec le monde, entre exégèse et polémique, dans quelques écrits attribués à Jean Chrysostome’, in M. Stavrou–J. van Rossum (dir.), *Écriture et tradition chez les Pères de l’Église*, CBP 17 (Brepols: Turnhout, 2017), 93–104.

127 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 8.4 (PG 53.73; FOC 74.112).

128 I. Sandwell, ‘Preaching and Christianisation: Communication, Cognition and Audience Reception’, in W. Mayer–C.L. de Wet, *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*, CAEC 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 137–174.

129 Ibid., *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews, and Christians in Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 19–22; cf. ibid., ‘How to Teach Genesis 1.1–19: John Chrysostom and Basil of Caesarea on the Creation of the World’, *JCS* 19.4 (2011), 559: ‘The members of Chrysostom’s audience, on the other hand, were left to deal with the confusion in Genesis’s creation narrative by themselves, and Chrysostom did little to engage with the cognitive processes of his audience’.

less by debating multiple opinions and more by 'arming his audience to defend a truth already established'.¹³⁰

Be that as it may, we may state Chrysostom's mass-communication aims in a more nuanced way by relating them to prior exegetical traditions, especially the scholastic context of question-and-answer. Chrysostom's connection with the cognitive apparatus of his audience may be more about an active discernment process regarding which questions from the exegetical tradition he felt would best suit his needs, even if these needs are for him the communication of a 'truth already established'. This is suggested by an important research trajectory that views Chrysostom's biblically-inspired metaphorical patchworks within a learned rhetorical and performative liturgical-civic context. Placing Chrysostom around internal developments within the Second Sophistic, Quiroga Puertas shows how Chrysostom deftly combined aspects of epideictic rhetoric with hagiography and biblical exegesis in his *Homilies on the Statues*, his discourse-responses to the 387 C.E. crisis in Antiochene economic and civic life.¹³¹ Further, Stenger has usefully analyzed Chrysostom's discourses with reference to schemes of cognitive poetics, addressing the potentially bewildering array of metaphors and imaginative spaces that are drawn together in the span of a homiletic-exegetical discourse. Stenger calls attention to how Chrysostom ascribes a different 'status' to disparate 'worlds' created by biblical images, references, quotations, in addition to contextual references such as to urban or rural landscape. The effect is a 'textual' layering that creates an 'interplay between the familiar and the unfamiliar' (*Wechselspiel von Vertrautem und Ungewohntem*), an alienation which in turn produces understanding and the concomitant knowledge of how to act.¹³² Stenger's compelling framework helps analyze exegesis for the images it produces and how these relate to other patterns and juxtapositions in the particular discourse. Combined with source analysis, we can gain a dynamic view of Chrysostom's rhetorical art. In line with Jauss and Blumenberg, we retain the notion of dialogue as naming the process by which Chrysostom interacted with and used exegetical traditions in the task of furnishing his audience with instruction through the production of parallel image frameworks (Stenger's Text-worlds). Sandwell does however raise the important category of mass-communication, which we may appropriate to ask what connections existed between his biblical exeget-

130 Broc-Schmezer, 'Théologie et philosophie', 188.

131 A.J. Quiroga Puertas, *La retórica de Libanio y de Juan Crisóstomo en la Revuelta de las estatuas*, Cardo 7 (Salerno: Helios, 2007).

132 Stenger, *Johannes Chrysostomos*, 27.

ical teaching and his own perception of how to equip his audience with the tools of knowledge to combat pagans, Jews, and heretical Christians.

To explore Chrysostom's double-dialogue, that with previous exegetical traditions and his mass-audience, this study shall unfold in two phases. Chapter 2 locates the *Homilies on Genesis* in the context of John Chrysostom's other works addressing issues of biblical (especially Old Testament) interpretation, drawing attention to his use of basic scholarly rhetoric such as 'searching the Scriptures' or noticing 'obscurities' on which to comment. Following this emphasis on formulations of scholarly study, in Chapter 3 I study how Chrysostom integrates traditions and formats of questions-and-answers into his *Homilies on Genesis*, showing that the content of his questions often relate to what Zamagni claims as 'real' textual difficulties, and that as Amirav already found, these supply him with material for finding moral paraenesis amidst difficult texts. In Chapter 4, I focus on the 'methodological' aspects of exegesis and linguistic commentary, especially onomastic interpretation, word glosses, and elucidation of scriptural 'habits'.

The second section analyzes in greater depth John Chrysostom's relation to previous authorial models of exegesis. Chapter 5 shows his nuanced profile amidst the Antiochenes. Chapter 6 shows his reliance on Basil of Caesarea and that these two shared exegetical traditions with considerable precision. Similar conclusions are reached regarding Eusebius of Caesarea in Chapter 7. Finally, Chapter 8 studies shared exegetical traditions between John Chrysostom and the Alexandrians, suggesting a dense network of exegetical learning and a cache of common techniques which supported Chrysostom's paraenetic task.

The *Homilies on Genesis*, Old Testament Interpretation, and the Rhetoric of Obscurity

According to Chrysostom, the whole literary field of the bible was conditioned according to various stages of moral pedagogy, a pedagogy aimed at the reformation of mankind. Biblical language does not present matters as they are in themselves but in constant relation to man's power to apprehend the divine accommodation.¹ Sometimes, the divine pedagogue discerned that obscure, difficult, or subtle language was needed to inspire the hearer to dig deeper into the meaning at hand. For Chrysostom, such language was concentrated in the Old Testament. While the New Testament is 'clearer' (σαφέστερα), the Old is full of mysteries and 'great difficulty' (πολλή δυσκολία).² Difficult though it may be, the effort to comprehend yields a spiritual 'treasure' (θησαυρόν) or 'benefit' (ὠφέλεια), which Chrysostom frequently identifies as the benevolence of the divinity or the ingenious virtue of an unsuspecting ancient hero. By Late Antiquity these were nearly hackneyed metaphors for the task of exegesis, common across both pagan and Christian works. Yet few studies have connected Chrysostom's copious use of such language to his appropriation of patristic exegetical traditions. The purpose of this chapter is to show that this rhetoric of obscurity encompasses a range of John Chrysostom's works addressing Scriptural interpretation generally and Old Testament interpretation in particular, much of which can be assigned to his early Antiochene preaching career. The *Homilies on Genesis*, which also likely emerged during this period, may be viewed as exemplifying the task of Old Testament interpretation as envisioned by the Chrysostomian tradition in the form that we have it.

¹ This has been a major concern in Chrysostom scholarship for more than a century: Chase, *Chrysostom*, 41–50; F. Fabbi, 'La «condiscendenza» divina nell'ispirazione biblica secondo s. Giovanni Crisostomo' *Biblica* 14 (1933), 330–347; Hill, *Reading*, 27–39; D. Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy. The Coherence of his Theology and Preaching*, OECs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 123–132.

² John Chrysostom, *Obsc.* 1.3.6–8 (SV 12.74).

1 The *Homilies on Genesis* in Recent Scholarship

Many studies have already identified John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* as an important example of the range of Chrysostom's exegetical practices. Asensio noted that in this series, Chrysostom frequently connects the exhortation to 'search the scriptures' with non-literal readings, such as pastoral concerns or what Chrysostom considered as the contemplation of divine realities.³ But these cases are not studied in depth, so the connection between scholarly exegesis and his techniques for directing his audience's attention to divine realities remains unclear. Hill notes that our *Homilies* develop a 'profound theology of the inspired word';⁴ but this observation does not incorporate his standing within patristic exegetical traditions nor much focus on the shared fund of linguistic resources from which Chrysostom drew. Similarly, Tonnias investigates Chrysostom's treatment of Abraham across the *Homilies on Genesis*.⁵ Yet it remains unclear how Chrysostom's construction of Abraham as a model of virtue relates to what Tonnias understands as *theōria*, the hermeneutical priority of Antiochene exegesis articulated by Diodore. It is noteworthy in this connection that as such, *theōria* rarely occurs in the *Homilies on Genesis* for exegetical purposes—other practices and traditions came to his aid. Sandwell assessed *Homily 2 on Genesis* with the question of the cognitive effects of his rhetoric and exegetical teaching, viewed as a complex organic whole, on his audience.⁶ The result is the important observation that Chrysostom correlated his own address with that of Moses' reflections on 'In the beginning' (Gen 1,1). Moses, like Chrysostom himself, is viewed as an orator with an audience. Chrysostom views Moses' audience as 'children', fixated on material things. Similarly, Chrysostom changes the perspective and proposes to his audience that they too are children, in the sense of beginners in the Christian faith. Sandwell's study helpfully shows how Chrysostom related exegesis and rhetoric. Yet like the preceding studies mentioned, the specific biblical exegetical techniques or traditions Chrysostom used to develop his ideas or practice of studying the Scriptures are absent from investigation. In the case of Sandwell, for instance, more may be said about Chrysostom's selection of an allegedly 'easy' lesson

3 F. Asensio, 'El Crisóstomo y su visión de la escritura', *Estudios Bíblicos* 32 (1973), 238.

4 Hill, *Reading*, 102.

5 Tonnias, *Abraham*, esp. 39–42.

6 I. Sandwell, 'A Milky Text Suitable for Children: The Significance of John Chrysostom's Preaching on Genesis 1:1 for Fourth-Century Audiences', in W.J. Lyons–I. Sandwell (eds.), *Delivering the Word: Preaching and Exegesis in the Western Christian Tradition* (London: Routledge, 2012), 80–98.

regarding the creation of the world. What relation did this lesson have with previous models of biblical interpretation, and how can these previous models help us measure Chrysostom's pedagogy?

On the other hand, studies in the vein of *Wirkungsgeschichte* attest to Chrysostom's standing in patristic exegetical traditions but often lack what the works above provide, namely rhetorical context. Harrison and Young include the *Homilies on Genesis* within surveys of exegetical traditions on the image of God in Gen 1,26 or Jacob's wrestling with the divine in Gen 32.⁷ Liebeschuetz has compared Chrysostom's interpretation of the creation account to that of Eusebius of Emesa and found one intriguing parallel at the level of terminology and others at the level of questions-and-answers.⁸ More generally, Chrysostom is often included in articles which aim to provide a panoramic view of Genesis exegetical traditions across numerous Christian authors, such as the flaming sword of paradise (Gen 3,24b), the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen 22), or the 'breath' of God (Gen 2,7).⁹

A relatively neglected 1993 study by Astruc-Morize and Le Boulluec compared the themes, images, and biblical texts that John Chrysostom used to articulate the exegetical enterprise with those of Origen, the former's *Homilies on Genesis* being a key source for their study. While its synthetic scope gives little room for understanding how such language about the obscurity or the

7 N.V. Harrison, 'Women, Human Identity, and the Image of God: Antiochene Interpretations', *J ECS* 9.2 (2001) 260–265; Young, 'Traditions of Exegesis'.

8 J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, 'How God Made the World in Seven Days: The Commentaries on Genesis of John Chrysostom (Homilies 1–12) and of Eusebius of Emesa (1–10), Two Distinct Representatives of the School of Antioch', *Antiquité tardive* 22 (2014), 243–253.

9 M. Alexandre, 'L'épée de flamme (gen. 3,24): textes chrétiens et traditions juives', in A. Caquot et al. (eds.), *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 403–441; Boulnois, 'Le souffle et l'esprit', 9, in which Chrysostom draws together two provocative anthropological texts, originally done by Irenaeus and expanded in Origen, to explain the creation of man; M. Harl, 'La «ligature» d'Isaac (Gen. 22,9) dans la Septante et chez les pères grecs', in Caquot et al. (eds.) *Hellenica et Judaica*, 472, in which along with others such as Theodoret, Chrysostom interprets the sacrifice of Isaac in reference to the day of 'rejoicing' announced in John 8,56; cf. G. Dorival, 'Le patriarche Héber et la tour de Babel: un apocryphe disparu?' in A. Frey–R. Gounelle (eds.), *Poussières de christianisme et de judaïsme antiques: Études réunies en l'honneur de Jean-Daniel Kestli et Éric Junod*, IRSB 5 (Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2007), 187 and J. Eskhult, 'The Primeval Language and Hebrew Ethnicity in Ancient Jewish and Christian Thought until Augustine', *REAug* 60.2 (2014), 296, in which Chrysostom witnesses the view that from the patriarch Heber (Gen 10,24) the Hebrew language was derived. The outstanding resource M. Alexandre, *Le commencement du livre Genèse 1–IV. La version grecque de la Septante et sa réception*, *Christianisme antique* 3 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1988) cites Chrysostom among patristic exegetical traditions regularly, but these are presented concisely.

hidden nature of exegetical meanings functioned in specific rhetorical contexts, Astruc-Morize and Le Boulluec established that Chrysostom and Origen shared linguistic and conceptual resources for explaining the adapted character of the biblical text and the means for discerning what is morally useful therein. In formulations from texts such as John 5,39, 'search the Scriptures', Chrysostom elevates the process of interpretation to the forefront of his eschatological paraenetical program. Merging typology and *mimesis*, a distinctly 'intellective' concern emerges from Chrysostom's reading of the bible, as his homilies regularly repeat the notion that the reader may discover these hidden, noetic, or spiritual values through proper interpretation.¹⁰ Particularly notable are contextual clues for discerning how these aspects came together. In *Homily 9 on Genesis*, for instance, Chrysostom rebukes heretics for their inappropriate 'questions' and yet later exhorts his audience to 'search' the Scriptures which he follows with discussion of exegetical difficulties.¹¹ This 'apophatic' motivation was explored by Leroux, who had already maintained albeit offhandedly that Chrysostom was profoundly similar to Origen as an exegete.¹² Leroux provided a different angle on Chrysostom's broad understanding of the relationship between bible hermeneutics and ethical conversion, namely his struggle with Anomoean rationalization.¹³ In this context, Chrysostom understands biblical revelation to be a work of renovating human comprehension through a grace which entirely transcends it. Because of the weakness of human capacities, all language, including that of the bible, presents obscurities of comprehension.¹⁴ These French studies thereby introduce Chrysostom into a more

10 G. Astruc-Morize–A. Le Boulluec, 'Le sens caché des Écritures selon Origène et Jean Chrysostome', *StPatr* 25 (1993), 5; 12–15, there is direct reciprocity between comprehension of the words of the Bible and true conversion in life; G. Astruc-Morize, 'Saint Jean Chrysostome, théologien, moraliste et mystique', in *Qu'ils soient Un! Mélanges offerts en hommage au métropolite Emilianos Timiadis* (Iasi: Trinitas, 2005), 67 repeats this integrative thesis.

11 Astruc-Morize–Le Boulluec, 'Le sens caché', 7.

12 Leroux, 'Relativité et transcendance du texte biblique d'après Jean Chrysostome', in *La Bible et les Pères. Colloque de Strasbourg (1–3 octobre 1969)*, BCESS (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1971), 74, suggests the difference between the two lies in the fact that Chrysostom removes the necessity of the incarnation of the Logos in the Bible itself, on which see M. Harl, *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du Verbe incarné*, Patristica Sorbonensia 2 (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1958), 210–214 and above, Chapter 1, n. 46. Chrysostom actually refuses to consider the Bible as a writing, despite how often he mentions God speaking by 'the writings'. Scripture is entirely metaphorical, in Leroux's vision of Chrysostom. This picture does not adequately account for the connection between the 'questions' he addresses from the text and the spirituality of Biblical study he espouses.

13 Leroux, 'Relativité', 68.

14 Leroux, 'Relativité', 70.

nuanced stance among his fellow Antiochenes, who viewed difficulties as practical problems to be solved and less as part of the divine pedagogy for all humans. Further, the studies just summarized raise questions about how these wider hermeneutical goals were practiced.

Young assessed the *Homilies on Genesis* similarly, but evidently independently—she does not cite the above French authors. With its broad scope, her project challenged the reduction of Chrysostom's hermeneutics to a precursor to modern historical criticism.¹⁵ Like a *grammaticus*, Chrysostom analyzed the language of the bible to deduce from it types for imitation, and thereby establish through typology a divine reality beyond the text that functioned as *skopos*, comparable to what Quintilian explains as a standard exegetical method of the Greco-Roman rhetorical schools. For Chrysostom, the 'treasure' or 'benefit' would be the discovery of how the details of the text correspond to the character and actions which he wished to ascribe to the divinity and thus what was worthy of imitation.¹⁶ Understanding Chrysostom's variegated use of hermeneutical terminology in relation to *mimesis* possesses explanatory power over much of his homiletic practice, even if Young's account focuses rather much on goal terminology such as *skopos*, *theōria*, and *akolouthia*. Scholarship after Young may profitably identify further key terms particular to individual authors, and, more importantly, demonstrate how such terminology functioned in relation to the use of exegetical traditions and the rhetorical purposes of individual works.

Following Young's influential book and Wilken's contribution,¹⁷ Mitchell studied this *how*—the ways Chrysostom used established rhetorical formats to elevate Paul's *eikōn* to a hermeneutical principle. She references the *Genesis* homilies as part of the pattern of establishing religious authority based in the lives of saints. The flexible Chrysostom who emerges from Mitchell's account is a master of 'necromantic' exegesis, practicing a multifaceted art of summon-

15 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 165, 182; 193; 248–257. A formulaic statement in John Chrysostom, *Comm. Isa.* 5.3 (sc 304.222) formed the basis of this reduction. Here, as Bultmann, Bate, Grant noticed, Chrysostom explains that the Biblical text itself offers the explanations to its own allegories, and that this law determines the admission of allegorical interpretation across the whole of Scripture. According to Young, Chrysostom was not here expressing a 'literal' hermeneutic. Instead, it is a rhetorical protest to what he regarded as arbitrary philosophy in relation to the text.

16 Fabbi, 'La «condiscendenza»', 332–334 for Chrysostom's use of 'benefit' as a metaphor for the exegetical 'answer' in the *Homilies on Genesis*.

17 R.L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews. Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th-Century*, TCH 4 (Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press, 1984).

ing Paul from the dead to speak to him regarding his texts and their meaning.¹⁸ While understandably losing sight of the *Genesis* homilies to focus on Chrysostom's works on Paul, Mitchell created a clear conception of how the *encomium* format combines with the techniques and formulations for grammatical and exegetical study, showing just how dense and integrated was Late Antique rhetorical culture in its applications. Paul himself becomes the exemplar portrait from which Chrysostom draws out the *skopos* of the biblical text. Mitchell's study does not present Chrysostom in relation to other patristic authors, but rather the wider methods and techniques of the rhetorical schools. Further, it opens the opportunity to inquire about different emphases in his approach to the exposition of the Old Testament, where Paul still figures large but is rarely 'summoned' as a primary interlocutor.

As we have seen, Amirav identifies Chrysostom's engagement with Alexandrian and Antiochene exegetical traditions as part of his spiritual interpretation of the bible and its application to the lives of his audience in three of his *Homilies on Genesis*.¹⁹ She showed that this exchange was fundamental to his pastoral task and theology, particularly as regards Old Testament exegesis. The phenomenon of 'scholarship' in Chrysostom Amirav locates within the broader construct of an author's approach to the question of allegory versus literalism, pointing to the shared resources, what we have called in Chapter 1 text-referent webs, between groups of Antiochene and Alexandrian authors.²⁰ To review an important case, Amirav finds that Chrysostom and Didymus rehearse the same exegetical tradition regarding Gen 6,11, in which God announces the flood and compares human beings to 'earth', persons not possessing his divine spirit. Chrysostom reflects on the rather striking expression and suggests that Noah alone of his generation retained the true character of a human being. On the other hand, the Godly way of life is available, on the basis of the 'image' in Gen 1,26, for all men to behave not like beasts but with self-control.²¹ This twofold exegetical tradition Chrysostom connects to the wider purpose of his *Homily 22 on Genesis*, namely the claims that individuals have full command over their decisions and the virtuous man is rational and self-restrained. Although Didymus and Chrysostom reference different biblical texts to prove the point, Didymus knows to discuss the metaphorical meaning of being a 'human' in relation to the bizarre expression and locate Noah as the 'true' human in relation to his

18 M.M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*, HUTh 40 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 43–44.

19 Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 218–235.

20 Ibid., 33–44.

21 Ibid., 161–163.

generation. The upshot of the pejorative sense of 'man' is that Noah's example indicates that all are capable of living the godly manner of life according to Gen 1,26.²² The relative precision of these ideas, the intentional construction of the same metaphors in relation to specific biblical texts, the allusion to the same text-referents, and the exegetical theme place Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* in a scholarly context shared by Antiochene and Alexandrian authors alike.²³ A chief concern of Genesis exegesis, Amirav finds, includes the rejection of anthropomorphic characteristics being ascribed to the deity. For Antiochenes, these are rationalized against the constant theme of the divine philanthropy and the free will of human beings. So, where the text does not clearly refer to or magnify these points, Antiochenes tended to rely on metaphorical patterns, typology, and other forms of non-literal interpretation to emphasize them.²⁴ Placed next to Mitchell, Amirav's work thereby establishes the lineaments of Chrysostom's own exegetical profile and elevates the utility of the *Homilies on Genesis* as a primary work from which to gain these impressions. Her work calls for a systematic analysis of rhetoric and exegesis in these *Homilies* so as to provide further nuance to how Chrysostom stood in relation to other Antiochenes and Alexandrians. By following this line, we can discern more about the extent of these shared exegetical traditions, the points at which Chrysostom demonstrates apparent ingenuity or independence, and how these play a role in his pedagogy.

The *Homilies on Genesis* contain a rigorous engagement with the exegetical culture of Chrysostom's day and form a particular set of emphases for Old Testament exegesis. These points about the importance of the *Homilies on Genesis* for John Chrysostom's wider homiletic-hermeneutical art can be placed into a more precise context: the teaching of Genesis in his own early career. In Chapter 1 we have already outlined how patristic exegetical traditions interlaced with pagan criticism, particularly in Genesis commentary. Discussing in greater detail the dating and context of the *Homilies on Genesis* positions us to view this work alongside other Chrysostomian works which raise similar exegetical questions, deploy similar formulations, and apply rhetorical techniques devoted to clarifying obscurity. The result is the tentative outline of a programmatic Chrysostomian-approach to Old Testament instruction, reflective of the awareness of the wider importance of Genesis and basic principles of scriptural interpretation for establishing the essentials of the Christian faith.

22 Ibid., 173. I return to this example for further illustration in Chapter 4.

23 Ibid., 222.

24 Ibid., 226–228.

2 Provenance and Pedagogy of the *Homilies on Genesis*

It is likely that John Chrysostom composed or delivered the *Homilies on Genesis* from Antioch. It is best to speak of this work as a micro-series, to adopt the terminology originally applied by Wenger and currently in use to describe works that derive from similar liturgical contexts and address coordinated biblical texts in at least a loose sequence.²⁵ As shall be discussed further below on the basis of Crépey's work, the *Homilies on Genesis* at many points satisfy criteria of internal reference, giving the impression that in the form that we have it, much of the text contained in the PG 53–54 was designed as a sequential treatment of the book of Genesis. Significant gaps or Chrysostom's articulation of breaks in this sequence expose important material for identifying the envisioned context of delivery.

The first point of interest for the *Homilies* is their relation to the *Sermons on Genesis* which likely precede them. The *Sermons* are an eight-sermon series which may be firmly set in Antioch, possibly in 386, the year of Chrysostom's ordination.²⁶ Most reconstructions place our *Homilies* after these *Sermons* due to length and reuse of material (I will return to the latter point). The provenance of the 67-homily *Genesis* micro-series rests largely upon a single criterion.²⁷ In *Homily 33 on Genesis*, Chrysostom references a break in the preaching sequence. During this break he addressed topics on the resurrection and the book of Acts.²⁸ Bonsdorff and Bauer took this to be a reference to four homilies *On the Prologue of Acts*. The first two of these homilies contain clear proof of Antiochene provenance, thereby in the view of Bauer linking the *Homilies on Genesis* to Antioch insofar as they are linked to *On the Prologue of Acts* 1–2. But Mayer has pointed out that the connection between *On the Prologue of Acts* and the *Homilies on Genesis* is tenuous. There are two reasons for this. First, the statement in *Homily 33 on Genesis* contains no clear reference to *On the Prologue of Acts* 1–4 *per se*. Second, Chrysostom may have preached on Acts in several different years.²⁹ Specifying the provenance of the *Homilies on Genesis* through the route of the homilies *On the Prologue of Acts* is therefore unsound.

25 Broc-Schmezer, 'Théologie et philosophie', 198–207.

26 Brottier, *Les Sermons*, 11–12.

27 Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 53. The standard criteria for establishing the provenance of John Chrysostom's works is found in Mayer, *Provenance*, 277–314.

28 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 33.1 (PG 53.305): ἐν ταῖς ἐφεξῆς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀναστάσεως τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἡμῖν παρασχεῖν διὰ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα γεγενημένων θαυμάτων, ὅτε καὶ τῶν Πράξεων τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ἐπιλαβόμενοι.

29 W. Mayer, 'The Sequence and Provenance of John Chrysostom's homilies *In illud: Si*

Nevertheless, recent studies of both series have tentatively affirmed the Antiochene and Paschal provenance of both the *Homilies on Genesis* and the homilies *On the Prologue of Acts* 1–2.³⁰ For the *Genesis* work, Crépey substantiates this claim by considering three features of the *Genesis* homilies brought up by earlier scholars. First, Dumortier and Wenger identified the style in the *Homilies on Genesis* as youthful and timid, indicating an early career composition. In itself, this is not a strong argument. Second, in the *Homilies on Genesis* there is the precedence of many thematic commonplaces throughout Chrysostom's work, such as the discussion of the changing of names in patriarch characters. Third, the season of Lent in 386 and in 387 are almost certainly occupied with other series,³¹ leaving 388 open for our *Homilies*, the date most preferred in recent scholarship.³² This is by no means certain. But following Crépey's cumulative picture, there are further reasons pertaining to the second criteria, precedence of thematic commonplaces, that the *Homilies on Genesis* may be cautiously considered a work emerging in some form from his Antiochene period.

The book of Genesis seems to have been a consistent concern in the early preaching career of John Chrysostom. If the *Homilies on Genesis* were composed in Antioch, then the series belongs to a context in which he frequently addressed the first book of the bible through individual homilies and micro-series. Bonsdorff, confident of Antiochene provenance, supposed that the *Homilies on Genesis* were seminal for John Chrysostom's entire career, show-

esurierit inimicus (CPG 4375), *De mutatione nominum* (CPG 4372), and *In principium Actorum* (CPG 4371); *Augustinianum* 46 (2006), 170 (discussion of Bauer, Wenger, and Tillemont), 181, 185. The sermons referred to are John Chrysostom, *In prin. Acta* 1–2, which deal with the changing of names.

30 For *Prologue*, M.-E. Geiger, *Les homélies de Jean Chrysostome In principium Actorum* (CPG 4371): *projet d'édition critique, traduction et commentaire*, 2 vols. (diss. Université Lumière Lyon 2, 2018); 1:19–26 provides a full discussion of previous scholarship on the dating of the *Prologue* works and the *Genesis* homilies in relation to others, discussed below. Geiger's presentation is of the highest utility because it lays out in table format three possible versions of the sequence dating regarding the *Homilies on Genesis* and what scholars have taken as other works preached around the paschal period, such as the *Sermon 9 on Genesis* and the *Homilies on the Changing of Names*. Geiger's forthcoming edition and commentary in both *Sources Chrétiennes* and *Texte und Untersuchungen* were not yet published at the time of revising the manuscript for the present volume.

31 This assertion is based on the firm dating of the Riot of the Statues to Lent 387; see F. van de Paverd, *St. John Chrysostom. The Homilies on the Statues. An Introduction*, OCA 239 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1991). From here, Brottier, *Les Sermons*, 11 reasons that the *Sermons on Genesis* must have taken place either in 386 (the year of his ordination) or 388.

32 Crépey, 'Les Homélies', 106–111, esp. 108; cf. D. Costache, 'Revisiting the Date of John Chrysostom's Homilies on Genesis,' *JThS* 68.2 (2017), 621–624.

ing that many themes treated therein recur throughout his *oeuvre*.³³ While this picture risks the imposition of an artificial unity and relies on the hasty construction of several homiletic series according to the questionable criterion of thematic correspondence, recent scholarship has provided grounds on which to ascribe Bonsdorff's idealism some value. From what we are able to tell,³⁴ in the years closely following ordination as a presbyter in Antioch, 386–389, Chrysostom likely delivered eight *Sermons on Genesis*,³⁵ several *Homilies on the Statues* which address various texts from the opening chapters of Genesis,³⁶ and 67 *Homilies on Genesis*.³⁷ Two homilies on *The Obscurity of the Prophets*,³⁸ preached in Antioch, explain the narrative of the tower of Babel (Gen 11) at length. The series of catechetical lectures discovered by Wenger were likely delivered in Antioch, and these contain several passages of extended typological exegesis of Genesis.³⁹ His *Sermon 9 on Genesis*, not a part of the eight *Sermons on Genesis* edited by Brottier, which discusses the significance in the changes of the names of several patriarchs, may be included in this picture, and to this may be related the *Homilies on the Changing of Names* (though the ordering is problematic) and the micro-series *Six Homilies on Isaiah* ('I saw the Lord')

33 M. von Bonsdorff, *Zur Predigtstätigkeit des Johannes Chrysostomus, biographisch-chronologische Studien über seine Homilienserien zu neutestamentlichen Büchern* (Diss, Helsingfors, 1922), 3–25.

34 For dating the following works to his early Antiochene period, most of them 386–389, see Mayer, *Provenance*, 511–512. Of the following list, only the *Ad pop.* 7–8 and several *Serm. Gen.* may be dated with certainty; the rest are based on the arguments found in the introductions to the critical editions or accompanying studies. See also the reconstruction in Geiger, *Les homélies*, 24–25.

35 John Chrysostom, *Serm. Gen.* 1–8 (SC 433); Brottier, *Les Sermons*, 13–22.

36 John Chrysostom, *Ad pop.* 7–8 (PG 49.91–102); van de Paverd, *The Homilies*, 7; 187–201.

37 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 1–67 (PG 53–54.579); Crépey, 'Les Homélies', 108–111.

38 John Chrysostom, *Obsc. Proph.* 1–2 (VS 12); Zincone, *Omeliie sull'oscurità*, 11–14.

39 J. Day, *The Baptismal Liturgy of Jerusalem: Fourth- and Fifth-Century Evidence from Palestine, Syria and Egypt* (London: Routledge, 2007), 35–38, summarizes the discussions in the critical editions of *Illum. cat.* 1 + *Cat. de iur.* + *Cat. ult. ad bapt.* (SC 366) and *Cat.* 1–8 (SC 50) along with the studies of Mayer, *Provenance*, and earlier attempts at dating his baptismal instruction. Day does not offer critical evaluation. Wenger, *Huit catéchèses*, 63–65, held that from the Stavronikita series which he edited, at least *Stav.* 6 (= *Cat.* 6) was preached in between our *In Gen. hom.* 32 and 33 in Antioch 388. This has been questioned by later scholars. Mayer, 'The Sequence and Provenance', 171, shows that Wenger's hypothesis relies on the link between *Cat.* 6 and *Serm.* 9 *Gen.* + *De mut. nom.* 4. But as we have already seen, in this article she has shown that precisely this link is uncertain. Crépey, 'Les Homélies', 90–99 assents to Wenger and provides further discussion of the break between *In Gen. hom.* 32 and 33, which likely occurred before and after Holy Week following Lent 388.

which deal with exegesis of Old Testament texts and literary patterns.⁴⁰ It is evident that John Chrysostom paid much attention to the book of Genesis during his career, with a possible concentration during his early career in Antioch. What were the concerns he brought to this text of the bible, and how do they fit with his *Homilies on Genesis* in particular? As Bonsdorff already suggested, this concentration on Genesis came about through practical and pedagogical circumstances.

Practically, during the late fourth-century, the text of Genesis was part of the Lenten lectionary in the regions of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Milan.⁴¹ One is not surprised to note that this eager but perhaps initially timid⁴² preacher

40 John Chrysostom, *Serm. Gen.* 9 (PG 56.619–630). Relying on Montfaucon, L. de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, vol. VII (Bruxelles: E.H. Fricx, 1702), 93–100 influentially established that this homily belonged to the series *De mut. Nom.* 1–4 (PG 51.113–156) and that these were delivered in the series break mentioned in *In Gen. hom.* 33.1 (see n. 71 above), and so belong to this considerable sequence (not necessarily intended as a contiguous, coherent, series) which includes *In Gen. hom.* 1–32 + *In prin. Acta* 1–4 + *De mut. nom.* 1–4 + *Serm. 9 in Gen.* + *In Gen. hom.* 33–67. The table in Geiger, *Les Homélies*, 25–26 lays this out most helpfully. Earlier scholars such as Wenger advanced this by clarifying that *Serm. 9 in Gen.* was delivered after *De mut. nom.* 2. Mayer, ‘The Sequence and Provenance’, 177 and 185 has shown that *De mut. nom.* 3–4 need to be considered as separate from the *De mut. nom.* 1–2 + *Serm. 9 in Gen.* sequence. Further, and more significantly, she has shown that these are not necessarily linked to *In prin. Acta* 1–2, whose Antiochene provenance is indisputable; the sequence *De mut. nom.* 1–2 + *Serm. 9 in Gen.* may have been delivered in another year than the *In prin. Acta* 1–2 and the *In Gen. hom.* 1–67 (which are themselves not necessarily linked). However, in this article Mayer did not deal with the hypothesis of Dumortier, *Homélies*, 10–13. He points out that in John Chrysostom, *In Oz. hom.* 2.3.1–2 (SC 277.97), mentions a treatment of names: *περὶ μὲν ὀνομάτων ἐν ἑτέρῳ καιρῷ διηγῆσομαι*. It is possible that he is referring here to the *De mut. nom.* 1–2 + *Serm. 9 in Gen.* sequence. Because *In Oz.* 2 was likely delivered in Antioch (Chrysostom references his early career and youthful speech), this would place the *De mut. nom.* 1–2 + *Serm. 9 in Gen.* sequence in Antioch. For our present purposes, the point stands that *Serm. 9 in Gen.* was likely delivered sometime during Chrysostom’s Antiochene career, and more precisely, in a paschal context.

41 Reconstructing the evidence for the lectionary during this period is complex. The work of John Chrysostom himself is a precious witness for this question. The initial survey of A. Rahfls, *Die alttestamentlichen Lektione der griechischen Kirche*, MUS 1.5 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1915), 114–120, was accepted by van de Paverd, *The Homilies*, 189–190. John Chrysostom, *Ad pop.* 7.1 (PG 49.92) mentions the ‘introductory reading’ as Gen 1.1–2, showing that by the first Monday of Lent in 387, the beginning of Genesis was read. R. Zervas, *Die Schriftlesung im Kathedraoffizium Jerusalems* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1968), 136 discusses the evidence from Western material.

42 In John Chrysostom, *Obsc.* 2.1.16–19 (VS 12.108) he compares himself to an inexperienced fisherman. This should not be overstated, however; there is no reason to suppose that a preacher in his later career could not make such remarks as rhetorical affectation towards

consecrated several works of homiletic biblical commentary to cohere with the liturgical life of his community. So, his first *Homily on Genesis* constructs a remarkable tapestry of biblical images illustrating the theological and moral significance of fasting.⁴³ Political circumstances also played a role. *Homily 7 on the Statues* illustrates the care of God for all humanity with reference to the creation of the world and humankind in the 'image of God' (Gen 1,26), which was apparently part of a pericope read in the liturgy. Chrysostom points out that God follows these instances of creation-mercy with his paternal response to original sin (Gen 3,2–7). With a city in fear of its status and livelihood after riots desecrated imperial images in 387, Chrysostom uses Genesis texts to remind his audience of the benevolent creator.⁴⁴

To advance the argument that the *Genesis* homilies belong to a coherent pedagogical context that proved fundamental for Chrysostom, several scholars have noted stylistic continuity. Bauer suggested that they may not have been delivered, but rather composed for later use.⁴⁵ If this is true, it does not obviate the fact that signs of delivery occur in numerous formulations; Crépey supplies the evidence that Chrysostom constantly references previous homilies, often quite specifically in regard to their exegetical content, solidifying the impression of the micro-series—and by way of adding to this, we may recall Chrysostom's *catena*-like self-designation mentioned above.⁴⁶ But recurring formulations do not only concern the features of live delivery and internal coherence. Several scholars have drawn attention to formulaic repetitions regarding theological or exegetical content in this series and others. Stock phrases and expressions recur around the explanation of biblical texts. Markowicz notes that several *Homilies on Genesis* correspond to aspects of the *Sermons on Genesis*. At points, these detailed correspondences verge on identity. These are text-referent traditions, the biblical text at hand matching with

expression of a prized religious sentiment. Notices of similar self-deprecation are discussed in Wenger, *Huit catéchèses*, 63, and Brottier, *Les Sermons*, 46–49. Based on the stolid impression gained from what he sees as Chrysostom's Antiochene homilies, Wenger judges his style too academic for the pulpit.

43 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 1 (PG 53,21–26).

44 John Chrysostom, *Ad pop. Ant.* 7.1–3 (PG 49,93–95). Van de Paverd, *The Homilies*, 304 shows that *Ad pop.* 7 belongs to the sequence of those delivered in Antioch; see further discussion of this event and Chrysostom's public addresses of it in J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, *Ambrose and John Chrysostom. Clerics Between Desert and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 209–215.

45 Ch. Baur, 'Chrysostomus in Genesim', *Theologische Quartalschrift* 108 (1927), 223; Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 51; cf. Cook, *Preaching*, 44–46.

46 Crépey, 'Les Homélies', 73–86; Chapter 1, n. 122.

the same teaching Chrysostom wants to give, such as an interpretation of Gen 1,26.⁴⁷ Observing similar phenomena elsewhere in Chrysostom's *corpus* such as the formulaic repetition of introductory statements or even the content of an exegetical teaching, Markowicz concludes that the composition of the *Homilies on Genesis* reflects a 'school environment'. Formulaic repetition reflects a 'common substratum of experience as a preacher and the common fund of scriptural interpretation inherited from his training'.⁴⁸ While we cannot be certain as to the precise process by which repetitions were achieved in the texts themselves—it very likely has something to do with the manuscript transmission history—our *Homilies* treated in a standardized, perhaps cautiously constructed form the pedagogy of the biblical text. For this reason, in addition to a parallel within the broader historical context of the Origenist controversy, Costache recently concluded that the *Homilies on Genesis* underwent a literary revision in Constantinople, where this controversy was in full force around the year 401.⁴⁹ While Costache overstates the parallel to the anthropomorphism of the Origenist controversy,⁵⁰ the point stands that the *Homilies on Genesis* contain carefully composed exegetical pedagogy.

A closer look at this nexus of Antiochene works addressing Genesis texts shows that we can be even more precise about Chrysostom's envisioned pedagogy. A range of specific exegetical difficulties seemed to swell up as the text

47 W.A. Markowicz, 'Chrysostom's Sermons on Genesis: A Problem', *JThS* 24 (1963), 652–664. The correspondences are as follows: *Serm.* 3—*In Gen. hom.* 9; *Serm.* 1—*In Gen. hom.* 2; *Serm.* 2/4—*In Gen. hom.* 8; *Serm.* 6/7—*In Gen. hom.* 15/18.

48 Markowicz, 'Chrysostom's Sermons on Genesis', 660–664, here 664; cf. Brottier, *Les Sermons*, 26–35 for Chrysostom's use of traditional exegetical and theological themes such as the harmony of scripture; 48–58 for the outline of some features of Chrysostom's rhetorical tactics for conveying his teaching to his audience.

49 Costache, 'Revisiting', 623. The indispensable account is E.A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy. The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014²).

50 See Chapter 8, which shows that multiple Alexandrian traditions of anthropology influenced Chrysostom at various points in both positive and negative ways throughout the *Homilies on Genesis*. This fact makes the selection of one particular controversy as the anchor of a 'revision' untenable—would the 'Christological' controversy regarding Diodore and Gregory of Nazianzus towards the early 380s provide similar pull if we could find homilies which referenced ideas related to this group (which, as far as the *Genesis* homilies go, we can, see Chapter 4, n. 212)? Further, both the earlier witness of Diodore and the later witness of Theodoret have the same discussion on Costache's alleged Chrysostomian Origenist anthropomorphite text. The question of anthropomorphism *vis-à-vis* the creation of man in Gen 1,26 was a common part of exegetical tradition. It is unsound to use Chrysostom's witness of this tradition as the ground for dating a text or its revision.

of Genesis emerged in the liturgy and so factored into the social context of his Antiochene congregation. He addressed many of these difficulties as exegetical traditions in the form of question-and-answers.

A host of questions (ζητήματα) about the names 'Eden' and 'Eve' emerges, he intones in the Antiochene *Homily 2 on the Changing of Names*, around the text 'in the beginning', and to these questions he has a 'solution' (λύσιν). Some of these onomastic traditions are mentioned also in the *Homilies on Genesis*.⁵¹ Also certainly in Antioch, *Homily 7 on the Statues* demonstrates God's care from Gen 1–3, an argument which could be expanded for the 'entire Bible' (πάσα Γραφή).⁵² But before doing this, he has a 'need' (ἀναγκαῖον) to address other problems that are 'worthy to inquire' (ἄξιον ζητῆσαι): why was the book of Genesis written 'after many later generations' (μετὰ πολλὰς ὕστερον γενεάς) following Adam's birth? Why was it given to the Jews only? Why was it written in the Hebrew language?⁵³ He reprises these concerns in his *Homilies on Genesis*. For there, in *Homily 2 on Genesis*, he addresses one of the exact points mentioned above, saying that it is 'worth asking here' ('Ἄξιον ἐνταῦθα διαπορῆσαι) why Genesis was written 'later after many generations' (μετὰ πολλὰς ὕστερον γενεάς) the events it narrates.⁵⁴ Remarkably, the same formulas are used for expressing the raising of the problem and its specific exegetical crux as those in *Homily 7 on the Statues*. We see further coherence between these two likely Antiochene works. In his *Homily 4 on Genesis*, the problem of how many heavens are depicted in Genesis 1 leads him on a long explanation of the providential translation of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek.⁵⁵ This explanation answers a question mentioned in his *Homily 7 on the Statues*, namely why the Old Testament was written in the Hebrew language. The catechetical needs of the Lenten period provide a framework for typological exegesis of the Old Testament. One instance from his likely-Antiochene *Catechetical Lectures* for those preparing for baptism, the rib of Adam signifies the Church (Gen 2,23), a notion found in previous exegetical models.⁵⁶ This 'hinting' (αἰνιττόμενος), as Chrysostom puts

51 John Chrysostom, *De mut. nom. hom.* 2.3 (PG 51.129); discussed further in Chapter 4.

52 Ibid., *Ad pop. Ant.* 7.4 (PG 49.96); Mayer, *Provenance*, 511.

53 John Chrysostom, *Ad pop. Ant.* 7.4 (PG 49.96). He mentions that he will have to wait for another occasion to answer these questions: *ibid.*, for 'our time is not sufficient' (τὸν καιρὸν ἡμῖν οὐκ ἐπιτρέποντα). The answer comes at another point, *ibid.*, 9.2 (PG 49.105): 'We ask, then, why after all these years were the Scriptures given' (ἐζητοῦμεν τοίνυν πρῶην τίνος ἔνεκεν μετὰ ἔτη τοσαῦτα ἐδόθησαν αἱ Γραφαί).

54 Ibid., *In Gen. hom.* 2.2 (PG 53.27).

55 Ibid., 4.4 (PG 53.42–43).

56 Ibid., *Cat.* 3.17–18 (SC 50.161,9–13); A. Le Boulluec, 'De l'unité du couple à union du Christ et de l'Église chez les exégètes chrétiens antiques', in P. Legendre (ed.), *«Ils seront deux en*

it, is expounded with stock technical exegetical language, and affirms Chrysostom's use of literary-critical terminology to dwell on the deeper understanding of the mystery of Christ.⁵⁷ Liturgical context, pastoral responsibility, apologetics, and biblical exegesis converge around his Antiochene treatment of Genesis.

Coherence between question and answer across multiple series suggests programmatic concerns to explain the Old Testament. He expressed these concerns with a language common to the exegetical culture of his day, namely by raising problems and questions or difficulties and obscurities. To contextualize Chrysostom's use of such language in the *Homilies on Genesis* and works stemming from a wider Antiochene emphasis on Old Testament exegesis, some background discussion to the scholastic development of the terminology of obscurity will be useful.

3 Commentary and Obscurity in Late Antiquity

The search for clarity was the stated goal of scholars ranging from the grammarian Dionysius Thrax in the fourth-century B.C.E. to the philosopher and literary critic Porphyry in the third-century C.E. and the later commentators on Aristotle.⁵⁸ The notion of clarity was regularly invoked as a device identifying grammatical, philological, and rhetorical points on which to comment. A classic example from the scholia on the *Iliad*, for instance, explains that the ancient poets were 'accustomed' (εἰώθασι) to explain an 'unclear aspect' (ἄσαφές

une seule chair». *Scénographie du couple humain dans le texte occidental* (Bruxelles: Émile van Balbergue Libraire, 2004).

57 I paraphrase here Viciano, 'Das formale Verfahren', 391.

58 Dionysius Thrax, *Thucyd.* 55 (USENER-RADERMACHER, 417,22–25) speaks of passages which are 'enigmatic and difficult to learn, requiring grammatical commentary' (τὰς δὲ αἰνιγματώδεις καὶ δυσκαταμαθήτους καὶ γραμματικῶν ἐξηγήσεων δεομένας); H. Baltussen, 'Philosophers, Scholars, Exegetes: The Ancient Philosophical Commentary from Plato to Simplicius', in C. Kraus–C. Stray (eds.), *Classical Commentaries: Explorations in a Scholarly Genre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 186–189 contextualize this statement in the early Hellenistic evolutions of grammatical exegesis. Compare Porphyry, *De phil. ex. orac.* fr. 109 *apud* Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praep. Ev.* 4.7.1 (GCS 43/1.177,7–8), where the explanation 'has brought' (μεταβέβηκα) about 'what is more clear' (τὸ σαφέστερον). Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 158–159 discusses clarity in the literary-critical techniques of Longinus and Plotinus. For Aristotelean commentators around the fifth- and sixth-centuries, see Elias, *In Isag.*, CAG 18/1.122,25–123,11, for whom the commentator must resolve 'the opening of obscurities in the unclarity of the words' (122,26, ἡ ἀνάπτυξις τῶν ἀσαφῶν τῇ λέξει). Baltussen notes that the discussions of Elias follow closely Simplicius, an earlier Aristotelean commentator and that their remarks on the task of the commentator in such a lucid and prescriptive way are the first of their kind preserved since Porphyry.

τι) of the author's style, such as a bizarre word or construction, in the subsequent line.⁵⁹ Pagan commentators also used obscurity as an apologetic device. Heraclitus supposed that Homer constantly wrote in allegorical style so as to make 'more intelligible' (γνωριμωτέρα) the 'obscurity' (ἀσάφεια) of his poetry, a comment ensuring that Homer said nothing indecent about the gods.⁶⁰ While many commentators held to the conviction that Homer was best interpreted on the basis of his own texts, even a student as scrupulous as Porphyry held that Homer kept things hidden (ἐπέκρυψε) and spoke in mysteries (δι' ἀνιγμάτων), leaving the interpreter to discern their meaning.⁶¹

Christian commentators adapted this task of bringing what was obscure into clarity, aided by the lexicographical field of the bible itself.⁶² Prov 1,6 spoke of discerning a 'parable' (παράβολή), and other texts like Sir 39,3 linked this term to the resolution or the 'seeking out' (ἐπιζητεῖν) of 'mysterious sayings' (ἀνίγματα). The Theodotion version of Dan 8,23 describes an ominous future king whose countenance is stern and intelligence capable of resolving 'difficulties' (προβλήματα), a term which the Psalmist also uses to summon the people to hear the law (LXX-Ps 77,2). Harl discerned two applications of these concepts in Christian exegesis of the Old Testament. First, obscure and difficult texts served a pedagogical function, to inspire the hearer to discover Christ 'hidden' there. Second, obscurity guarded the truth from those who, like the Jews rejecting Christ, were not morally prepared to receive it.⁶³ These applications are witnessed from Justin in the second-century to Chrysostom in the fourth, as they served both exegetical and apologetic aims.⁶⁴

59 Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic*, 202, shows how this explanation is paralleled in four scholia traditions.

60 Heraclitus, *Probl. Hom.* 41.12 (WGRW 14.76).

61 This is the testimony of Stobaeus, *Anth.* 2.1.32 (HENSE-WACHSMUTH, II:14,12–13), quoting from Porphyry's lost work *The Styx*. For contextualization of this passage, see J. Lambertson, *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*, TCH 9 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986), 113.

62 For discussion in Greek Christian authors: G. Dorival, *Les Nombres*, BA 4 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994), 135 Harl, 'L'«obscurité»', 338–339 and *ibid.*, in M. Harl–G. Dorival–O. Munnich, *La bible grecque des Septante*, Initiations au christianisme ancien (Paris: Éditions du Cerf—Éditions du CNRS, 1988), 306–307; for Jerome: P. Rollinson, *Classical Theories of Allegory and Christian Culture*, Duquesne Studies 3 (Pittsburg, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1981), 29–35. R.E. Heine, 'Gregory of Nyssa's Apology for Allegory', VC 38.4 (1984), 360–370 shows that in his preface to his *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, while Gregory offers nuanced support of Origen's spiritual interpretation against Antiochene rejections of allegory, he develops his case largely from the use of Pauline terminology and ideas.

63 Harl, 'L'«obscurité»', 341–349.

64 On Chrysostom, S. Zincone, 'La funzione dell'oscurità', *StPatr* 32 (1997), 393–409; R.C. Hill, 'Chrysostom on the Obscurity of the Old Testament', *OCA* 67.2 (2001), 371–383.

For Harl's first category, Origen famously viewed the Scriptures metaphorically 'locked up' as with a key. He explained this further as its possessing many 'obscurities' (ἀσαφείας) and 'difficulties for human comprehension' (δυσλήπτων τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ φύσει).⁶⁵ The task of the interpreter is to fit the keys in the correct locks, a research for the hidden *kerygma*, or treasure of symphonic unity under the impoverished letter. Often, he had apologetic aims in sight. While pagans like Celsus ridiculed the bible as incapable of providing a framework for higher meaning, Origen maintained the bible's obscurity as fundamental to his allegorical method and integral to God's salvific purposes for the Gentiles.⁶⁶ By linking this metaphorical searching for treasure to the language of obscurity, Origen could establish his own hypothesis of the text behind its letters.

With differing emphases and methods, Antiochenes capitalized on this metaphor and its accompanying literary methodology. But their adaptation of such terminology seems to coincide with a 'shift' in patristic exegetical priorities.⁶⁷

65 Origen, *Proem.* 1.1–2 (TU 183.102); 26–28 (104). Harl, 'L'«obscurité», 343, 350–355 contextualizes this idea in relation to Justin and Jewish tradition and elaborates it throughout Origen's works; Neuschäfer, *Origenes*, 276–285 links the same notion to Porphyry and other Hellenistic textual commentary practices; A. Fürst, *Von Origenes und Hieronymus zu Augustinus. Studien zur antiken Theologiegeschichte*, AK 115 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 92, discusses obscurity and confusion in Origen's prefaces within the context of Late Antique theological works. See *De prin.* 4.3.14–15 (BEHR, 11:556) for the notion that 'the treasure of divine meanings is contained in the fragile jars of clay of the letter' (*diuinorum sensuum thesaurus intra fragile uasculum uilis litterae continetur inclusus*), which may be paralleled with the fragment attributed to Origen in *Coisl.* 121 (CCSG 15.125, 26–27): λεκτέον ὅτι οὐ δεῖ περιέχεσθαι τοῦ γράμματος τῆς γραφῆς ὡς ἀληθοῦς, τὸν δὲ κεκρυμμένον θησαυρὸν ἐν τῷ γράμματι ζητεῖν. Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 24–26 understands the jars of clay metaphor as a distinction between words and their meaning, basic to the environment of textual commentary in antiquity.

66 J.-N. Guinot, 'Muthos et récit biblique chez Origène. Un danger d'ambiguïté', in G. Heidl–R. Somos (eds.), *Origeniana Nona: Origen and the Religious Practice of his Time. Papers of the 9th International Origen Congress. Pécs, Hungary, 29 August–2 September 2005*, BETL 228 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 181–186 for Origen's response to Celsus on this point. Famously, Porphyry rebuffed Origen for grounding his allegories in the alleged obscurity of the bible, as discussed in G. Binder, 'Eine Polemik des Porphyrios gegen die allegorische Auslegung des Alten Testaments durch die Christen', *ZPE* 3 (1968), 95 and P. Sellew, 'Achilles or Christ? Porphyry and Didymus in Debate over Allegorical Interpretation', *HTR* 82.1 (1989), 85–90. In Porphyry's opinion, the bible's rudimentary style hardly merited this approach, as seen in Porphyry, *C. Christ.* Fr. 6 (TK 52.133, 19–20) = Eusebius of Caesarea, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.19.4 (GCS 9/2.556): '[Some Christian allegorists] boast that the things said clearly [φανερῶς] by Moses are enigmas [αἰνίγματα]'.

67 Martens, *Adrian's Introduction*, 50–51; J. Lössl, 'When is a Locust just a Locust? Patristic Exegesis of Joel 1:4 in the Light of Ancient Literary Theory', *JThS* 55.2 (2004), 575–599 for mainly Latin authors, but with the addition of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Antiochene interests were typically more practical than the elaborate spirituality which guided Origen's use of obscurity. Of a piece with the concern for 'harmony', however, Theodoret announces in the preface of his *Questions on the Octateuch* that the goal of the work is to make clear (σαφῆ) problems and difficulties in the text; thus the questions-and-answers structure of his work.⁶⁸ Close to Theodoret's context, Adrian states in his *Introduction*, the sole Greek handbook on biblical interpretation surviving from the period, that the goal of interpretation is to establish 'the clear [σαφηνειαν], word-for-word, commentary'.⁶⁹ Polychronius, the brother of Theodore of Mopsuestia, brought together a list of ten causes of the 'many obscurities' (ἁσαφείας πολλάς) of the biblical text, such as the change of verb tenses or the structure of the original Hebrew wording.⁷⁰ The scholastic commentaries on the Psalms by Diodore and Theodore often remark that the stylistic peculiarities ('habit' or 'custom') of the Septuagint can be 'clarified' by attending closely to words in their context.⁷¹ For instance, in his commentary on the Psalms, Diodore points out that the metaphor (μεταφοράν) of the Psalmist's body 'wasting away' is difficult to understand; it is spoken obscurely (ἁσαφῶς).⁷² Martens argues that for Antiochene authors around John Chrysostom, very often the methodology for achieving clarity was the gloss and paraphrase, as in the *progymnasmata* of Greek and Latin rhetoric.⁷³ The prolific Antiochene reference to biblical obscurity also emerged from awareness and use of the Hexapla.

Using the three recensions of the Septuagint known as Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, Origen introduced the idea that these versions could, at times,

68 Theodoret, *Q. Oct.* pro. 4 (LEC 1.2). J.-N. Guinot, 'Les *Questions sur l'Octateuque et les Règles* de Théodoret de Cyr: œuvre originale ou simple compilation?', in Bussièrès (ed.), *La littérature*, 191, points out that σαφηνίζειν is the goal stated in Theodoret's preface to his *Q. Reg.*, in which he will deal with translation issues, ambiguity, context, and technical terms; cf. Hill, *Reading*, 96–97, Martens, *Adrian*, 50–51.

69 Adrian, *Intr.* 76 (MARTENS, 280,2).

70 Polychronius, *Job.* pro. 2 (PTS 40.151,3); cf. J. Lössl, 'A Shift in Patristic Exegesis: Hebrew Clarity and Historical Verity in Augustine, Jerome and Theodore of Mopsuestia', *Augustinian Studies* 33.2 (2001), 157–175.

71 Mariès, *Études*, 101, notes that showing the clarity of the words is an aspect of Diodore's general hypothesis to some Psalms. Schäublin, *Untersuchungen*, 43–55 shows that Diodore's style of commentary resembles a school environment.

72 Diodore, *In Ps. ad* 31,3b (CCSG 6.183,36–37). For Theodore on obscurity and clarity, see Schäublin, *Untersuchungen*, 126, 130, and Devreesse, *Essai*, 57–58.

73 Martens, *Adrian's Introduction*, 51–52; J.-N. Guinot, 'Un évêque exégète: Théodoret de Cyr', in C. Mondésert (dir.), *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible*, BT 1 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1984), 346: 'Le recours à la paraphrase est alors un moyen commode pour dissiper l'obscurité du texte ou éclairer une construction difficile'.

bring greater 'clarity' (σαφήνεια) to the Septuagint text, which he held as authoritative based on its divinely inspired translation but not ultimately or exclusively constitutive of meaning.⁷⁴ Indeed, without committing to a *Hebraica veritas* position, he held that the sense of the Septuagint text was the same as the sense of the Hebrew.⁷⁵ According to Harl, Origen used the variants displayed by the Hexapla within a theological framework. All words of Scripture speak of Christ, he believed, and words as such are signs that refer to a reality 'beyond what is written'.⁷⁶ When Origen spoke of the 'hidden treasure' (κεκρυμμένος θησαυρός) buried beneath the words of Scripture, that wisdom is Christ.⁷⁷ On this view, the Hexapla for Origen provided not just a methodological tool for finding clarity of exposition, but a theological path for finding purity of heart.

This methodology and its theological background impacted Eusebius of Caesarea and the Antiochenes who trained prior to and with John Chrysostom. The Caesarean did not subscribe to so strong a view of the Logos of Scripture, but rather found the unity of the text in the *skopos* of a more generic divine philanthropy.⁷⁸ The response was likely not all positive, and certainly

74 Origen, *Sel. in Ps.* 2,1–2 (PG 12.1104c–d), discussed in S. Morlet, 'L'utilisation des révisions juives de la Septante dans la première littérature chrétienne. Philologie, exégèse et polémique', in R. Gounelle–J. Joosten (eds.), *La Bible juive dans l'Antiquité* (Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2014), 119 and Kamesar, *Jerome*, 4–28, esp. 14 n. 34. What Kamesar says here needs repeating: 'Origen did not regard clarity as the criterion for determining the better text'. The present point I wish to make is that the regard for clarity is merely a part of his exegetical enterprise in relation to the Hexapla.

75 D. Barthélemy, 'Origène et le texte de l'Ancien Testament', in Fontaine–Kannengiesser (eds.), *Epektasis*, 259; Morlet, 'L'utilisation des révisions', 118–120, esp. 119n. 11. The methodological relationship between the Hebrew and the Greek versions of the Old Testament is discussed in E.L. Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory. Canon, Language, Text*, svc 114 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 178–189.

76 M. Harl, *Le langue de Japhet. Quinze études sur la Septante et le grec des chrétiens*, Centre Lenain de Tillemont (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992), 263; ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 116; C.M. Chin, 'Origen and Christian Naming: Textual Exhaustion and the Boundaries of Gentility in Commentary on John 1', *J ECS* 14.4 (2006), 407–436.

77 Origen, *C. Mt.* 10.5 (GCS 40.5, 18–20; HEINE, 1:36–37): 'The treasure which has been hidden in the field, however, is the concealed thoughts underlying the obvious meanings of the wisdom which has been hidden "in a mystery", that is in Christ' (ὁ δὲ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ κεκρυμμένος θησαυρός τὰ ἀποκεκρυμμένα καὶ ὑποκείμενα τοῖς φανεροῖς νοήματα τῆς σοφίας «ἐν μυστηρίῳ» ἀποκεκρυμμένης καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ). Cf. *De prin.* 4.1.7.152–164 (BEHR, 11:478–480) in which the teachings of scripture are providentially hidden in the inelegant (εὐτελεῖ καὶ εὐκαταφρονήτῳ / *ulterioribus et incomptis*) words of the text. Our weakness (ἀσθένειαν / *infirmities*) cannot comprehend them all.

78 D. Barthélemy, 'La place de la Septante dans l'Église', *Recherches Biblique* 8 (1967), 17–22 and 'Eusèbe, la Septante et «les autres»', in *La Bible et les Pères. Colloque de Strasbourg* (1er–

not uniform. Eusebius of Emesa, who taught Diodore, put his own spin on Origen's comparative method. He raised the criticism that the Jewish versions, such as Aquila, had obscured the clarity of the sense of the original Hebrew. In his view, recourse to the Syriac could 'bring clarity of mind' (յայտնաւորութիւն մտացն մթացոյց) for a fresh Greek translation, which he himself provided.⁷⁹ On the other hand, Theodore of Mopsuestia argued for a radical acceptance of the Septuagint. Fully aware that the Septuagint was often unclear due its translated character, in his later *Commentary on the Minor Prophets* he comes to the view that the exegete must clarify the Septuagint by internal reference alone, without recourse to alternative versions like the Syriac or the Jewish recensions. The Septuagint itself is the single greatest witness to the Hebrew, according to Theodore. Though steeped in obscure literalism, the Septuagint preserved the concision of the original. The task of the exegete was to highlight the Septuagint's patterns of expression, thereby vouchsafing the meaning of the divinely inspired original.⁸⁰ While manifestly distinct from Origen's spirituality of textual plurality, Theodore's ideas derive from the third and fourth-century Christian environment in which obscurity and clarity in biblical exegesis were foundational concepts for the techniques of textual criticism and the wider debates about the validity of non-literal reading.

The authors around John Chrysostom, then, were using the language of obscurity and clarity in a variety of technical senses pertaining to biblical exegesis. Familiar with these debates and their methodological applications, John Chrysostom addressed many exegetical difficulties in the Old Testament through the category of obscurity and related terminology. Works that have been assigned or tentatively assigned to Antioch, the *Homilies on Genesis* among them, witness a concentration of these difficulties. John Chrysostom

3 octobre 1969), BCESS (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1971), 51–65 for discussion of Latin and Greek authors. Guinot, 'La fortune' outlines its reception in the Greek Antiochene authors of the fourth-century, to which Chrysostom belonged. Chrysostom is omitted from the survey, except for a brief mention (218 n. 19). For Syriac authors, S. Brock, 'The Resolution of the Philoxonian/Harklean Problem', in E.J. Epp–G.D. Fee (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism. Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honor of Bruce M. Metzger* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 325–343.

79 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen. pro.* (TEG 15.23); ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 90–99; 117, emphasizes that in this sense Eusebius of Emesa departs from his namesake of Caesarea and Origen, paving the way for Jerome's conviction that an entirely new translation was required. Jerome's conviction on this point is discussed in detail by Kamesar, *Jerome*, 39–81.

80 Ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 136; Devreesse, *Essai*, 83; Schäublin, *Untersuchungen*, 123–138.

applied the language of obscurity and clarity to the task of Old Testament interpretation in three ways: identifying exegetical points, raising questions, and identifying the limits of human knowledge.

4 The Rhetoric of Obscurity in Antiochene Works

Chrysostom's constant refrain regarding the dialectic between the precision and the accommodation of scripture is documented in Rylaarsdam and Hill, but these works downplay the rhetorical role of exegetical obscurities in Chrysostom's works.⁸¹ Accommodating its speech to human understanding, the scriptures dress divine realities in clothing recognizable to weak human intellects. But it does so exactly as the divine authorship intended for the pedagogical concern of the moment.⁸² Thus, Chrysostom appreciated the bible's simple style. Where critics like the pagan emperor Julian had scoffed at its poor quality, Chrysostom saw treasure, or as he puts it, the 'clarity' (σαφήνεια) of its images.⁸³ It may be surprising to note, then, that in Chrysostom's mind this monument of precision could also be a cavern of obscurity in need of elucidation. Like other Antiochene exegetes, he raised this concern with respect to the Old Testament in particular.

First, there are a number of recurring formulations from works likely stemming from his Antiochene period. 'Perhaps it is unclear' (τάχα ἀσαφές),⁸⁴ he says in his *Homilies on the Obscurity of the Old Testament*, envisaging the rapport between the giving of the Sinaitic law in Ex 34,29–35 and the interpretation of this text in 2 Cor 3,12–14. Further in the work, he returns to this theme with a more apologetic angle. The 'veil' (κάλυμμα) of which Paul speaks is 'the obscurity' (τὴν ἀσάφειαν) of the Old Testament, for it prefigured the events of Christ's salvific economy to reach not only the Gentiles, but also the Jews.⁸⁵ Yet he knows that the Old Testament is 'more difficult' (δυσκολωτέρα) than the New because it was not originally written in Greek, signaling his awareness of the Antiochene reaction to the grammatical and linguistic problems of translation. He asserts a reserved agnosticism about the translation process as such, after

81 Hill, *Reading*, 39; Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy*, 123.

82 Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy*, 115.

83 John Chrysostom, *Comm. Isa.* 5.8.65–66 (sc 304.250).

84 John Chrysostom, *Obsc.* 1.6.50 (vs 12.98); 2.6.50 (*ibid.*, 142).

85 *Ibid.*, 2.3.1–13 (vs 12.118): ὡκονόμησεν ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ χάρις πρὸς τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐρμηνευθῆναι τὰς Γραφάς, οὐ τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἰουδαίων. Cf. 1.7.41–61 (vs 12.102–104).

the fashion of the preface to Sirach, declaring it is not possible to transfer the clarity (σαφήνεια) from one language to another.⁸⁶

In an explanation of the Genesis creation account in *Homily 9 on the Statues*, there is a 'need' (ἀνάγκη) to get Gen 1,1 'clearer' (σαφέστερον) for his audience.⁸⁷ The terminology of obscurity enables Chrysostom to concentrate on a single word and manipulate its meaning. 'What then is this, "the gates of Hades"', he asks. 'Perhaps what is said is unclear' (τάχα γὰρ ἀσαφές τὸ εἰρημένον), but multiple Biblical texts cited together explain the meaning of these 'gates' mentioned in Mt 16,18—the goal was to create a symmetrical tapestry between the common images of Old and New Testaments.⁸⁸ In order to raise the attention of his hearers, he suggests that a parable of Christ contains an inherent 'difficulty' (δυσκολία) of comprehension. In a clever move, Chrysostom wrests a word from its context in the book of Hebrews to expand this point. The Old Testament is 'difficult to interpret' (δυσερμήνευτος, Heb 5,11), whereas the coming of Christ offers 'clearer and more accurate teaching' (διδασκαλίας σαφεστέρας τε καὶ ἀκριβεστέρας).⁸⁹ Obscure also are the meanings of the priest Melchizedek in Genesis 14 and the Old Testament's hinting at the future outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost.⁹⁰

86 Ibid., 2.2.25 (VS 12.114); 2.2.31 (VS 12.116); discussion in Léonas, *Septante*, 93–98.

87 John Chrysostom, *Ad pop. Ant.* 9.3 (PG 49.107). On dating and location in Antioch, see n. 47 above.

88 John Chrysostom, *In prin. Acta* 2.1 (PG 51.77). Mayer, *Provenance*, 368 and 'The Sequence and Provenance', 175, is certain that this text was delivered in Antioch.

89 John Chrysostom, *In Matt. hom.* 7.1 (HM 1:87); for Antiochene provenance, Mayer, *Provenance*, 511.

90 John Chrysostom, *Adv. Jud.* 7.5 (PG 48.923) and John Chrysostom, *Exp. in Ps. IV* 8 (PG 55.50), respectively. The *Expositiones in Psalmos* is to be cited with caution, as its composition and even authorship are not fixed. Much of what is available in the PG 55 derives from *catenae*. There is confusion of title, genre, and attribution. For instance, *Homilies on Psalms 101–107* (PG 55.635–674) are really a collection of unattributed *catenae* fragments, which G. Dorival, 'La postérité littéraire des chaînes exégétiques grecques', *RÉByz* 43 (1985), 223 has suggested were fabricated from as many as four different sources; cf. M. Richard, 'Quelques manuscrits peu connus des chaînes exégétiques et des commentaires grecs sur le Psautier', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 3 (1955), 95. In the case of *Hom. Ps 41* (PG 55.161–166), the homily ends, and *catenae* traditions are simply added in order to supplement commentary on the remainder of the psalm (Dorival, 'La postérité', 224–225). Not all the cases are this extreme, but these examples suffice to illustrate the difficulties involved. Mayer, *Provenance*, 361–362 discusses the problems in dating *Exp. in Ps.* to a secure location in Chrysostom's career, but does not rule out the traditional attribution to Antioch for some form of the text.

Closely related to the rhetoric of obscurity and clarity was that of concealment and finding. The meaning of the Scriptures is found ‘not in the reading of the text alone’ (οὐκ ἀναγινώσκειν μόνον), but in ‘the understanding’ (ἐπιγινώσκειν). He explains this with a metaphor that reaches far and frequently across his *œuvre*. As seekers of treasure, the preacher and his audience must ‘dig to the depths’ (διερευνήσης τὸ βάθος) in order to find the significance, not scratch the surface of the words, even small ones like names.⁹¹ In a moment of self-reflection, he illustrates his role as a preacher and expositor of Scripture in these terms: I do not wish to leave unnoticed ‘the hidden treasure of Scripture’s sense’ (τὸν ἐγκεκρυμμένον αὐτῆς τῇ διανοίᾳ θησαυρόν).⁹² In *Sermon 2 on Genesis*, after explaining the identity of the divine royal plural ‘Let us make’ in Gen 1,26 as a reference to the Son, the same metaphor emerges. While the Old Testament books may have originally belonged to the Jews, he claims that the ‘treasure of the books’ (τῶν βιβλίων ὁ θησαυρός) lies ‘with us’ (παρ’ ἡμῖν), that is, both ‘the letters and their meanings’ (τὰ γράμματα καὶ τὰ νοήματα).⁹³ The ‘meanings’ here envisage the referent of the divine royal plural, a major concern of *Homily 8 on Genesis* and elsewhere.

Finally, as Leroux mentioned, he addresses the ‘meanings’ of scriptural exegesis from the problem of human comprehension in comparison to the divine reality. Contemporary controversy over Eunomius and his followers raised the problem of how to describe the relationship between the Father and Son of the godhead. Drawing on Basilian resources, Chrysostom reiterated some well-developed ideas regarding the limits of the human creature’s knowledge capacities.⁹⁴ In Antiochene works addressing these Eunomian controversies, Chrysostom regularly referred to the ‘middle state’ (τὸ μέσον) or gap between creature and creator in relation to comprehending difficult biblical texts, and

91 John Chrysostom, *De mut. nom. hom.* 4.3 (PG 51.148); Mayer, ‘The Sequence and Provenance’, 176–186, shows that this homily should be dislocated from the series of the previous three, and was possibly preached in different years than both the sequence *De mut. nom.* 1–2 + *Serm. 9 in Gen.*, and the micro-series of *In Gen. hom.* 1–67.

92 John Chrysostom, *Profect. Ev.* 12 (PG 51.320).

93 John Chrysostom, *Serm. Gen.* 2.83–85 (SC 433.188).

94 T.R. Karmann, ‘Johannes Chrysostomus und der Neunizänismus: Eine Spurensuche in ausgewählten Predigten des antiochenischen Presbyters’, *SE* 51 (2012), 79–107, and further discussion of Chrysostom’s place in the Basilian and Meletian alliance in Chapter 6; A. Wenger, ‘Jean Chrysostome’, in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 8 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1974), 338, emphasizes that Chrysostom believed in direct contact with God through fervent prayer, such that one could render unnecessary the standard human requirement for instruction in divine matters.

he appealed to Scripture as the binding means to guide us to proportionate knowledge of the incomprehensible.⁹⁵

A practical way Chrysostom addressed this gap in relation to biblical exegesis was through the identification of potential contradictions and drawing out a proper way 'to take' specific expressions in context. When two or more texts appeared to speak of different divine realities, he could argue that a single sense united them. For instance, LXX-Ps 43,24 depicts the Lord 'asleep' but a line in Jer 14,9 depicts him 'awake'. Instead of a contradiction, these texts speak of different aspects of the same divine nature, that is, longsuffering and purity. 'Both [texts] speak truthfully [ἀληθῆ]', he says, 'if you take the proper sense [προσήκουσαν ἔννοιαν ἐκλάβης]'.⁹⁶ But the matter is more complex than this, as he often referred to a theological framework in which language was far more ambiguous. 'Let us take as befitting God' (θεοπρεπῶς ἐκλάβωμεν), he says in an Antiochene address against Anomoean ideas regarding the divine names in the bible. For even these are spoken 'with humility of language' (διὰ τὴν ταπεινότητα τῶν ῥημάτων).⁹⁷ Passing beyond the words of the bible must be done in reference to the transcendent divine nature which can never be fully grasped. Chrysostom thereby uses the terminology of spiritual progress for understanding the interpretative task. In a homily on the Gospel of John possibly delivered later in his Antiochene career,⁹⁸ he cites Ex 33,20, 'No one has ever seen God'. Yet, scripture often enjoins us to seek after the vision of God. 'Let us seek the place' (τὸ χωρίον διερευνησώμεθα), he proclaims, 'in order to take [ἐκλάβωμεν] all words worthily of their spiritual sense [πνευματικῆς ἐννοίας]'.⁹⁹

95 John Chrysostom, *Incomp.* 2.328–230 (SC 28^{bis}.168), on Gen 1,26; on the Church as bride of Christ as bridging this gap, *Cat. ult. ad bapt.* 3.1.7–25 (SC 366.212–214); Dorival, 'Le sens de l'écriture', 441–442; Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 158–184; Astruc-Morize–Le Boulluec, 'Le sens caché', 15; J.-M. Leroux, 'Jean Chrysostome et le querelle origéniste', in Fontaine–Kannengiesser (eds.), *Epektasis*, 337.

96 John Chrysostom, *Pet. Mat. fil. Zeb.* (= *C. anom. hom.* 8) 56–57 (SC 396.172). See also *De christ. prec.* (= *C. anom. hom.* 10) 248 (ibid., 258).

97 John Chrysostom, *Incomp.* 4.270 (SC 28^{bis}.249); *De consub.* (= *C. anom. hom.* 7) 245–250 (SC 396.132).

98 Mayer, *Provenance*, 23, 224, and 277 shows that previous attempts by Quasten, Baur, and Bonsdorff in locating this series in Antioch are based on problematic assumptions. The text itself is problematic and, based on two distinct recensions, may have substantial scribal interference. It is therefore cited here as summative and illustrative, not necessarily belonging to the cumulative weight of my argument.

99 John Chrysostom, *In Jo. hom.* 15/14.1 (PG 59.97). The 'all words' (τὸ πᾶν) here refers to 'that reading to us just now laying in the fold' (τὸ νῦν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀνάγνωσμα κόλπον), earlier in the passage.

In works likely stemming from John Chrysostom's Antiochene career, the language of obscurity and unclarity captures a wide range of exegetical practices and homiletic contexts. Through this lens he raised issues of translation, theology, exegesis, and prophetic typology. This lens permits us to see the limitations of his non-literal interpretation. For certain difficulties cause him to stretch the boundaries set by other Antiochenes concerned with elucidation of linguistic difficulties in the Septuagint and move to typological speculation or theological debate for apologetic purposes. Further, he found the language of spiritual interpretation and meaning to be essential for his pastoral task, framing it in moral categories like 'humility'.

5 The Rhetoric of Obscurity in the *Homilies on Genesis*

When we turn to the *Homilies on Genesis*, we see these ideas developed with free reign. On several occasions he makes the general exhortation for his audience, 'let us not to glide hastily over' (μὴ ἀπλῶς παραδράμωμεν) the reading, but attend 'clearly' to the accuracy (ἀκριβείαν) of the words, for nothing is written idly (παρέργως).¹⁰⁰ Significantly, he concentrates the concern for clarity in formulas that bridge his homilies. In several introductions, he says that there is a 'need to comment' (ἀναγκαῖον ὑπομνήσαι) so as to bring 'clarity' to the previous 'teaching' (ὑπόθεσις) and thereby make the present one more readily intelligible (or vice versa).¹⁰¹

In the *Homilies on Genesis*, the rhetoric of clarity and obscurity can also announce to his audience the arrival at the interior of his argument or the purport of the exegetical point he wishes to make. Thus, when Chrysostom explains the significance of the number seven in the bible, which is for him the signification of plurality or multitude, he demands 'let us understand' (κατανοήσωμεν) that the matter will be 'clearer' (σαφέστερον) if he relates Cain's seven sins to other biblical texts that use the number seven to reference plurality or multitude, showing the comparative procedure of an exegetical tradition.¹⁰² 'It needs to be examined' (Σκόπησον), he insists, how the addition of a syllable to Abraham's name, likely hard to detect based on an extra α alone, 'clearly' fore-

100 Ibid., *In Gen. hom.* 33.1 (PG 53.307). Similar expressions are found in 56.3 (PG 54.490) and 60.4 (54.519).

101 Variations of this expression occur in the following prologues, which also mention the previous day's teachings: John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 3.1 (PG 53.33); 10.3 (53.84); 20.1 (53.166); 27.2 (53.241); 40.1 (53.369).

102 Ibid., 19.5 (PG 53.164). For the tradition, see Chapter 6.

tells God's promise to the great patriarch.¹⁰³ In this vein, when God in the text of Genesis appears to treat two women very differently, enabling one to conceive children and reserving the other for infertility, scripture 'clearly' marks the reason in a subsequent verse, and a reference to a Psalm text can substantiate his point.¹⁰⁴

The related metaphor of seeking treasure or hidden depths within the context of Old Testament interpretation resurges in his *Homilies on Genesis*, functioning with the same exegetical purpose as the stated goal to find clarity. First, he speaks about these exegetical difficulties in terms of regular patterns, such as 'frequently' (πολλάκις) or naming a 'custom' (ἔθος) of Scripture. Then, he views the meanings of texts as hidden 'riches' (πλοῦτος), 'treasure' (θησαυρός), 'capacity' (δύναμις), or 'depth' (βάθος) of the text. He modifies these prizes as 'spiritual' (πνευματικόν) or pertaining to the category of 'thoughts' (νοήματα). These treasures are almost always found 'in tiny words' (ἐν βραχέσι ῥήμασιν) or in 'a term' (λέξει) of the text.¹⁰⁵ The notion of each word—and more specifically, small words—possessing profound value coheres with Chrysostom's understanding of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Again, in an introduction, Chrysostom introduces his teaching with the metaphor of treasure found 'in a single syllable' (ἐν μιᾷ συλλαβῇ), placed there because the prophets were inspired (ἐνηχούμενοι) by the Spirit of God.¹⁰⁶

What are some of the teachings he draws from such treasures? In a homily addressing the descent of the human race from 'Adam' (Gen 5,1–2), he claims that 'in the mere names [ψιλαῖς προσηγορίαις] are hidden great riches [ἐναπόκειται πλοῦτος] of thought'. He then explains why: to teach 'the whole of philosophy' (φιλοσοφίας ἀπάσης) for future generations such as our own.¹⁰⁷ On at least two occasions, the 'topic' (ὑπόθεσις) of genealogical texts is 'a treasure of thoughts' (θησαυρὸν νοημάτων) because they provide examples that 'we may imitate' (μιμώμεθα) and from which 'you profit' (ἐκερδάνετε) by the 'memory' (μνήμην) of their deeds.¹⁰⁸ This modulation between forms of address,

103 Ibid., 39.3 (PG 53.364).

104 Ibid., 56.3 (PG 54.490).

105 Ibid., 3.1 (PG 53.32); 8.1 (53.70); 16.1 (53.125–126); 27.1 (53.341).

106 Ibid., 21.1 (PG 53.175); 15.1 (53.119). Asensio, 'El Crisóstomo', 224–231, synthesizes Chrysostom's mentions of scriptural inspiration in his *Homilies on Genesis*, but does not note the connection between inspiration, subtle treasure, and Chrysostom's call to study these tiny words and exegetical difficulties. Cf. Hill, *Reading*, 31, who outlines similar comments in Chrysostom's *Expositions on the Psalms* and Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy*, 124 for the wider framework of Chrysostom's notion of inspiration within divine pedagogy.

107 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 21.3 (PG 53.179).

108 Ibid., 23.5 (PG 53.204); 20.5 (53.172–173).

first-person hortatory and second-person imperative, is a common pattern for Chrysostom to identify points of scripture on which he wishes his audience to pay attention. In a particularly vivid elaboration, he recommends that the words of scripture are 'of spiritual and precious stones' (πνευματικῶν καὶ τιμίων λίθων), for which only a bit of labor will produce great 'wealth' (δαψιλεία). The stone in mind is the word ποιήσωμεν, 'Let us make' (Gen 1,26), the same issue brought up in *Sermon 2 on Genesis*. The labor is likened to the 'seeking out' (ἐπιζητούσα) of small details which must not be neglected or taken for granted.¹⁰⁹ In another case, the paradox of great treasure in tiny words is applied to whole passages, such as that of Cain and Abel (Gen 4) or the incest of Lot's daughters (Gen 19,30–32). In both cases Chrysostom uses the same expression, a 'hidden treasure' (ἐγκεκρυμμένον θησαυρόν) to signal the raising of exegetical difficulties. The former narrative should be read so as not to miss 'one jot' (κεραία μία, a clever reference to Mt 5,18), for therein are spiritual realities (τὰ πνευματικά).¹¹⁰ A complex exegetical discussion ensues, in which Chrysostom adapts ideas from Basil of Caesarea in considerable linguistic detail.¹¹¹ For the latter narrative, the treasure is 'difficult to discern' (δυσερμηνευτον).¹¹² Rather than demur to inscrutability, however, Chrysostom gives a structured answer to the problem of incest which resonates with previous exegetical models, making the same point raised by Didymus and elsewhere in his *Homilies on Genesis* (cf. case study in Chapter 4), namely that these daughters were trying to preserve the human race.¹¹³ A scholarly background informed Chrysostom's framing and articulation of how to raise and explain the Old Testament's obscurities.

Guinot established that for Chrysostom, biblical prophecy occurs either in words from the speeches of biblical characters or in their 'deeds' (πράγματα) described in narrative.¹¹⁴ In the *Homilies on Genesis*, these prophetic referents are also treated with the terminology of clarity and obscurity, and they are often

109 Ibid., 9.1 (PG 53.76–77).

110 Ibid., 18.4 (PG 53.154).

111 See Chapter 6 for the evidence.

112 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 44.4 (PG 54.410–411). J.-N. Guinot, 'La frontière entre allégorie et typologie. École alexandrine, école antiochienne', *RSR* 99.2 (2011), 11–12 and *ibid.*, 'L'exégèse allégorique d'Homer et celle de la Bible sont-elles également légitimes?', *Auctores Nostri* 2 (2005), 97, 104, 108–109 for discussion of this Genesis text in Origen and Antiochene authors such as John Chrysostom and Theodoret.

113 See Chapter 8 for further comparison.

114 J.-N. Guinot, 'L'exégèse figurative de la Bible chez les Pères de l'Eglise', *Revue sémiotique et bible* 123 (2006), 12; 14–17. For discussions of other Antiochene approaches to the role of prophetic fulfillment in the interpretation of the Scriptures, see Guillet, 'Les exégèses', 280 and H.N. Bate, 'Some Technical Terms of Greek Exegesis', *JThS* 24 (1923), 63.

resolved with reference to the events of Christ's life or the life of the Church from the Gentiles in relation to the Jews. Applying the exact same expression in *Sermon 2 on Genesis*, towards the beginning of his *Homily 8 on Genesis*, Chrysostom states that while the letters of Scripture belong to the Jews, the 'meanings' (νοήματα) belong 'with us' (παρ' ἡμῖν).¹¹⁵ Thus, when recalling the rare typology of Tamar's children (Gen 38) as corresponding to the Jews and the Church, which he expounded earlier, Chrysostom remarks that 'perhaps now it is necessary to tell it again more briefly and more clearly' (τάχα νῦν ἀναγκαῖον συντομώτερον πάλιν αὐτὸ καὶ σαφέστερον) in order to set the stage for another prophetic-typological interpretation of Gen 49.¹¹⁶ The apologetic angle emerges again as 'a hidden treasure' (κεκρυμμένον θησαυρὸν) in the 'obscure' prophetic referents of the names of Noah's sons, for they typify the submission of the Jews to the calling of the Gentiles.¹¹⁷ Our preacher reveals the 'hidden' reference to the Gentile encroachment, and there are detailed parallels between Chrysostom's explanations of these typologies and those of other Christian exegetes using the same tradition.¹¹⁸ He discerns the resurrection in several texts around the narrative of Enosh and Enoch, where the biblical texts mentions these characters as, respectively, 'rising' (5,3–5) or being 'snatched' (5,24), references which he describes as 'murky' (ἀμυδρῶς).¹¹⁹ Other revelations of the events of Christ's life in the Old Testament are framed as a 'type' (τύπος) and 'hint', such as Melchizedek hinting (αἰνιττόμενος) at the mysteries of bread and wine, the same expression used to identify Christ and the Church in Gen 2,23 in one of his *Catechetical* lectures delivered in Antioch.¹²⁰ References to the events of Christ's salvific economy are thus not arbitrary figural readings, but fit with a theoretical goal to resolve obscurity and relate to previous exegetical traditions.

As in his *Homily 2 on the Obscurity of the Old Testament*, in *Homily 4 on Genesis*, Chrysostom addresses the fact that some interpretative difficulties are the result of the categorical weakness of the material circumstances of the biblical text as a translation. A long excursus ensues, involving a narrative of the trans-

115 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 8.2 (PG 53.71); *Serm. Gen.* 2.83–85 (SC 433.188).

116 *Ibid.*, *In Gen. hom.* 67.2 (PG 54.535).

117 *Ibid.*, 29.7 (PG 53.271).

118 See Chapter 7 for Chrysostom's use of Eusebius of Caesarea for Tamar's children and Chapter 8 for Chrysostom and Origen describing Japheth as a type of the Church from the Gentiles; the former is the stronger case.

119 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 21.3–4 (PG 53.178–180); see further Chapter 6.

120 *Ibid.*, 35.5 (PG 53.328). L.F. Pizzolato, 'L'antitipo: un concetto tra esegesi e mistagogia', *ASE* 17 (2000), 168–169 helpfully explains 'type' as connoting a 'hard' object which causes 'rebound or repercussion'.

lation of the Septuagint, the reference of Hebrew and Syriac language forms, and the conclusion that Scripture is not ‘contradictory to itself’ (ἐναντία ἑαυτῇ). Finally, he has thus revealed the ‘capacity of the things contained’ (κειμένων τὴν δύναμιν) in the Scriptures.¹²¹ This demonstrates his awareness of Antiochene linguistic concerns, but he adapted them with his own vocabulary and his heightened emphasis on the looming possibility of contradiction—other Antiochenes were more varied in their approach of identifying potential problems.

In the *Homilies on Genesis*, Chrysostom also addressed exegetical difficulties with reference to the limits of mankind’s comprehension, as we saw him do in works addressing Eunomian ideas. He often turned these cases to illustrate a spiritual teaching about progress in knowledge and in virtue. For while the powerful words of Gen 1,1, ‘In the beginning,’ contain a definitive anti-heretical teaching about the origin of matter and the power of divinity, the treasure of the teaching is ‘abundance of a spiritual kind’ (τῆς πνευματικῆς ἡ δαψίλεια), and as such we have not grasped (ἐξισχύσαμεν) the whole of it.¹²² But he recognizes that the weakness of human intellects risks misconstruing what the bible, the Old Testament in particular, means to say about the divine. One passage appears to describe the divine as possessing states of mind (Gen 8,1), but Chrysostom is ready to insist that the expression should be taken in a ‘fitting sense to God’ (θεοπρεπῶς). It is written this way, he goes on, ‘for the sake of our nature’ (πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀσθένειαν).¹²³ Viewed against the theological backdrop of Anomoean controversy and Septuagint translation awareness, this expression takes on a new exegetical importance. When he remarks that Moses began his creation account not with the invisible realm of angels and celestial powers but with the concrete visible realities of the sky, the sun, and the earth, this was because all education begins with ‘the first fundamentals’ (τὰ πρῶτα στοιχεῖα) and then proceeds to the more complex and lofty matters. Adopting a common exegetical tradition, Chrysostom says that Moses did this because he was addressing Jews, steeped in ‘thickness’ (παχύτης). Hopefully through his instruction they could avoid idolatry, and, hopefully through Chrysostom’s instruction, his audience will make such progress.¹²⁴ The analogy between digging for exegetical ‘treasure’ and the moral life is expanded in the *Homilies on*

121 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 4.4 (PG 53.42–43).

122 *Ibid.*, 3.1 (PG 53.32).

123 *Ibid.*, 26.3 (PG 53.232).

124 *Ibid.*, 2.3 (PG 53.29). The same argument, that the books of Moses were written in order to lead the materialistic Jews away from idolatry, is found in Antiochene authors prior to Chrysostom such as Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 4e (TEG 15.33) and Diodore, *Coisl.* 5 (CCSG 15.5).

Genesis. For ‘just as’ (καθάπερ) digging for physical treasure is difficult, so too is the attainment of the ‘virtues of the righteous’; just as there is great benefit from these effort, so too will the benefit be great for those heeding his scriptural instruction.¹²⁵ This is particularly effective after an exposition of Jacob’s altar to God (Gen 35,7) which he corresponds to the ‘spiritual sacrifice’ mentioned by Paul and the ‘pure in heart’ of the dominical discourse (Mt 5,8).

But this point raises the question, how exactly did Chrysostom connect his exegetical teaching with his aims for the moral improvement of his audience? To illustrate, we turn to a case study of *Homily 37 on Genesis*. First, I paraphrase-summarize the homily from the basis of the PG 53 text and Hill’s FOC 82 translation. Then, I show the coherence of this discourse around the construction of spatial oppositions and the elaboration of the concept of opposition. I show how he uses scholarly ‘attention’ rhetoric to modulate his discourse, pointing out where exegetical traditions occur to support his constructions. Quotations from PG 53 and FOC 82 pages are cited in parentheses.

6 Case Study: *Homily 37 on Genesis*

This homily covers Gen 15,7–21, not as a systematic commentary treating every verse similarly, but at least quoting each verse, in some case offering paraphrase and in select cases offering detailed exegetical discussion. After the division of peoples and languages over the globe (Gen 11), the Genesis-narrative homes in on the family of Tharra, who migrates from Chaldea into Charran, part of the land of the Chaldeans (11,31). There, God appeared to Abram and bids him to go further on to a land ‘which I will show you’ (12,1–3), with blessings in abundance. In Gen 12,5, Abram takes members of his family, his wife Sarah and his nephew Lot, and they travel to Canaan which God promises as part of the land inheritance (Gen 12,7). A number of dramatic episodes ensue involving the present inhabitants of the land, and some tension with Lot. The difficulties lead to Abram questioning God himself regarding the veracity of his promises: ‘How shall I know’ (15,8). To respond, God makes a covenant with Abram (15,9) using animals and fire amidst darkness (15,11–12). God then repeats his promise and provides greater clarity about Abram’s coming odyssey: his descendants will be enslaved but return to this land (15,13–14). Abram himself will not be around to see it (15,15) because it will happen after four generations (15,16), but that does not stop God from specifying just how far this land inheritance shall extend (15,18–21).

¹²⁵ John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 60.3 (PG 54.523).

6.1 *Summary of Homily 37*

'Search the Scriptures' (John 5,39), says Christ, and in the few words of God's dialogue with Abram, 'count the stars', and in the latter's response of faith, we can study their profound meaning and appreciate their spiritual beauty and abundance. By aligning our teaching today with that of yesterday (341–342), we can fortify ourselves against the devil.

We can paraphrase today's texts and thereby understand God's constant care for the patriarch. First, God identifies himself as the one 'who brought you out of the land of the Chaldeans and gave you this land for your inheritance' (Gen 15,7–8). That is like God saying, I took you from your home to give you what I promised—this is the same transfer that Steven speaks about in his martyr-discourse (Acts 7,2–4). This paradox shows God's philanthropy to Abram: he brought him out of the safety of his homeland, but Abram's faith and physical well-being prospered according to divine promises (343).

Abram responded by saying something like, 'It would be nice to know how I will inherit the land'. Just as human beings of old, the divine made a covenant by sacrificing mature animals to help Abram's faith (343–344). By picking the sunset as the time to do this, God acted as he usually does and helped humans see his virtuous character clearly by depriving Abram of the physical senses.

God even gives Abraham a sense, albeit imprecise, of the trials to come for his people: they will be carried into slavery for 400 years (Gen 15,13–14). That is to teach him not to rely on any human consideration (344), because God suggests that he will visit those slave-drivers with vengeance (345). God tells Abram this because it shows just how far beyond the capacities of human nature are the divine promises. So, when God promises Abram that he will reach a 'fine old age' and then 'go to your fathers' (Gen 15,15), this refugee-patriarch is placed in the line of righteous men like Abel, Noah, and Enoch—something we would never expect of a refugee (345).

Someone might raise a difficulty with what the text says next (346). God explains how long it will take for his people to return from slavery. As previously (Gen 15,13–14), God now says the return to Canaan will happen after the 'fourth-generation' (Gen 15,16). The problem is that they did not even spend half that time in Egypt. However, this is not really a problem if you begin the counting from when Abram starts his refugee life, namely since God originally ordered him to leave Charran (Gen 12,4). He was 75-years old at that time—count it yourself. Also, consider that God may have brought the exile in Egypt to a close earlier than the appointed time due to his kindness. Longsuffering, he always lets up on punishing us if we repent (346).

God's covenant speech to Abram only confirms the lengths he will go to fulfill his promises, stretching the land to far extents and populating the earth

with Abram's family, even though his wife is barren (347). To close our sermon, we should imitate Abram. For these remarkable events are confirmation of his words and virtuous deeds; his mind never wavered, and his disposition remained steady. This is why Paul praises Abram's faith-disposition (Heb 11,8).

We are like refugees of this earth, on our way to heaven. Thus, we should willingly neglect the extravagance of expensive clothing and lavish feasts (348), practicing the 'contentment' of which the apostles speak (1 Tim 6,8) and despising 'greed, the root of all evil' (1 Tim 6,10) which is really just our desire to go beyond natural limits all the time and gain public attention. Do you not realize that Christ himself is naked (349), that the Lord of all human beings takes as done to himself what we do to our countrymen? This should make those who prance around in public with their expensive silk garments think twice about the coming judgement, not to mention the World's Teacher Paul explicitly forbids such extravagance (1 Tim 2,9). Like Paul, let us practice good deeds and so adorn our soul with beauty. The true wealth is to want only what is necessary (350) because then you are free from injury and necessity.

6.2 *Between Obscurity and Opposition*

The *prooemium* of this homily contains a remarkable concentration of language exhorting his audience to study minute words with precision and zeal. The great treasure of the bible's spiritual thought is concealed beneath the surface of the tiniest of details. The text which Origen and Chrysostom regularly invoked, John 5,39, 'search the scriptures', is blended with variations on the 'hidden treasure' metaphor: the great 'capacity' (δύναμις); the 'immense wealth' [πλοῦτος] of ideas concealed in its expressions'. In such a short space he also uses multiple hortatory address: 'let us reap the benefit' (καρπωσώμεθα); 'do not simply skim over' the bare reading (μὴ προσέχωμεν); 'let us be capable [δυνήθωμεν] to descend to its very depths and grasp the true sense'. Culminating this dense coordination of the rhetoric of exegetical obscurities, he lands on the epistemological limitations of human beings: the teachings of scripture are 'opposite' (ἀπεναντίας) to human wisdom (341). Around this progression coheres the entire homily.

Using the language of opposites, he then contrasts the literature of human wisdom with the works of Scripture. 'For these' (ἐκεῖ μὲν γάρ), one determines meaning through elaboration 'of the beauty and composition of words' (κάλλους ῥημάτων ἢ συνθήκης). But for the bible, 'it is the opposite' (ἐνταῦθα δὲ τοῦναντίον): one digs below the surface of subtle words to find the 'hidden riches'. Chrysostom thereby creates a metaphorical spatial juxtaposition between the

two kinds of literature,¹²⁶ one kind assessed through amplitude and the other through depth. In this contrast between different kinds of knowledge, there is an element of what Stenger has identified as Text-Worlds in Chrysostom's spatial rhetoric.¹²⁷ By associating basic concepts and images pertaining to literature (the length of a discourse or book), he formulates various 'modalisations' for viewing the bible as a different kind of book altogether, clues which formulate commands to act in accordance with his intention. In addition to hortatory addresses such as 'let us not skim over the bare reading', he further establishes his exegetical-rhetorical context by vacillating between first person singular, first person plural, and plural imperative: 'I want [βούλομαι] to pick up that very thread [ἀκολουθίας] and link together what was said yesterday with what follows so as to make a complete commentary [ἐξήγησιν] on the reading so that we may send you [ὕμᾱς ἀποπέμψωμεν] from here. But pay precise attention [προσέχετε], I beseech [παρακαλῶ] you. If the labor is ours [ἡμέτερος], the gain is yours [ὑμέτερον]' (PG 53.342; FOC 82.341, mod.).¹²⁸ Chrysostom elaborates his spatial network by extending the oppositions to an epistemic distance between preacher and audience. To conclude the *proæmium*, he adds a final dimension of opposition. By attending to the spiritual benefit of the exhortation (παραίνεσεως) of the text, he proposes, 'let us fortify [ἀποτειχίσωμεν] against the plot of the evil daimon' (342), thereby casting the importance of his teaching in the widest possible terms.

Chrysostom then shifts the kaleidoscope on the concept of opposites and focuses on whether Scripture contradicts itself. He brings up two major exegetical difficulties throughout the homily. First, he addresses the location of Abram's calling. Then, he addresses the timing of the exile in Egypt. These two topics function as the major graphic maps of the biblical text-world for his discourse.

126 See J. Stenger, 'Athens and/or Jerusalem? Basil's and Chrysostom's Views on the Didactic Use of Literature and Stories', in P. Van Nuffelen et al. (eds.), *Education and Religion in Late Antiquity: Genres and Discourses in Transition* (London: Routledge, 2013), 86–99 and 'John Chrysostom and the Power of Literary Imagination', in J. Stenger (ed.), *Spätantike Konzeptionen von Literature, The Other Antiquity 2* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2015), 207–226 for further discussion of Chrysostom's approach to the didactic function of literature. Spatiality plays a crucial role in Chrysostom's constructions of the intellectual and social boundaries of his idealized community, as explored by C. Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy* (Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press, 2014) and J. Stenger, 'Where to Find Christian Philosophy? Spatiality in John Chrysostom's Counter to Greek *Paideia*', *J ECS* 24.2 (2016), 173–198.

127 J. Stenger, 'Text Worlds and Imagination in Chrysostom's Pedagogy', in Mayer-de Wet (eds.), *Revisioning*, 206–246.

128 Stenger, 'Text Worlds', 215–216.

To draw out the ‘mindset’ or ‘disposition’ (γνώμη) of Abram, which is ‘faithful’ (πίστος), Chrysostom focuses on the calling of Abram out of his homeland, which gives him a status as a ‘refugee’ (ξένος, PG 53.345; FOC 82.346¹²⁹) or ‘vagrant’ (ἀλήτης, PG 53.341). This material vagrancy provides the conditions for achieving spiritual wealth. To arrive at that goal rhetorically, Chrysostom engages a difficulty from the exegetical tradition. A problem arises out of specifying the location from which God called Abram. The Genesis text says that God brought Abram out of the land of the Chaldeans (15,7–8), but in his martyr-speech in Acts 7,2, Stephen says that God called Abram while in Mesopotamia. In fact, Chrysostom already dealt with this problem in previous Genesis homilies where he raised the ‘question’ of whether these texts ‘contradict’ themselves.¹³⁰ Not rehearsing the more detailed defense already given, presently, he asserts ‘agreement’ (σύμφωνα) between the texts, a common rhetorical-exegetical term in ancient commentary and Christian biblical exegesis in particular.¹³¹ Chrysostom draws upon an exegetical tradition addressed by Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore, his own iteration resembling more the former.¹³² Stephen’s speech was well-known in Late Antiquity, as Gregory of Nyssa attests to a feast-day in his honor, and the Acts 7 speech contained important points for trinitarian theology.¹³³ Chrysostom derives from this identification of possible contradiction the emphasis on God’s providential care and fulfillment of his promises even in the face of seemingly impossible circumstances. Abram’s vagrant status required the utmost faith, for to bring a family from infertility is the same as to ‘bring things from non-being to being’ (343), a common expression denoting concepts of the singularity of divine power and essence. The patriarch’s disregard for material things and the creator’s philanthropy are heightened by further textual details, such as the scene in which the two swear a covenant in the dark, which reminds Chrysostom of God’s ‘habit’ (ἔθος) and ‘characteristic activity’ (οἰκείαν ἐνέργειαν) of communicating to humans in a way that gets them ‘to see’ him who is spiritual (344). Chrysostom establishes this ‘habit’ by reference to the giving of the law on Mount Sinai in which a vortex of smoke shrouded Moses. He also references Psalm 104,32 which mentions ‘the

129 I retain Hill’s translation of this word, often rendered ‘stranger’ or ‘foreigner,’ because ‘refugee’ better captures the transitive and sojourning character of the circumstances, and Chrysostom himself seems to have understood the term this way, as I show below.

130 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 31.3 (PG 53.285); 36.1 (PG 53.333).

131 See the magisterial survey of S. Morlet, *Symphonia. La concorde des textes et des doctrines dans la littérature grecque jusqu’à Origène* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2019).

132 In Chapter 4 I study this in greater detail.

133 J. Leemans, ‘Reading Acts 6–7 in the Early Church: Gregory of Nyssa’s First and Second Homilies on Stephen the Protomartyr’, *StPatr* 47.4 (2010), 9–19.

smoking mountain'. 'Entrancement' (ἔκστασις) of the encounter with the divine is thereby associated directly with 'darkness' (σκοτεινός). Here Chrysostom effects a major component of his discourse-understanding through 'reassessment'.¹³⁴ The obscurity and hidden depths of biblical texts are transferred to the veiling of the divine. But the journey towards both is associated with a similar intellectual ascesis that requires moving beyond the surface appearance. Chrysostom modulates his discourse on these details with careful 'attention' expressions: 'It should be observed' (παρατηρητέον), another common exegetical expression,¹³⁵ to point out the detail in Genesis mentioning the hour of evening (darkness) when the covenant was made; 'why ... because' to specify this point further; 'later when ... at the time' to compare the Abram covenant event with the giving of the Sinaitic law. Brilliantly, the identification of a 'habit', a scholarly term for explaining patterns across a text's language and ideas, is applied to elucidate the divine character itself and drive home the point that this character is 'opposite' human understanding but made graciously accessible.

Abram's ability to rise above human restraints is also seen vividly in his old age. When God promises Abram that you will 'go to your fathers after reaching a fine old age' (Gen 15,15) Chrysostom reckons that this 'hints' (αἰνιττόμενος) that Abram should be numbered among his righteous biblical predecessors, Abel, Noah, and Enoch—precisely not his family heritage, or as Chrysostom paraphrases, 'not to fathers in the flesh' (345). The use of the technical 'hints at' is indication of a tradition of non-literal interpretation which viewed these patriarchs within a single spiritualized *skopos*. This sequence is made all the more striking by Chrysostom's quotation of Abram's speech to a rich man recently deceased: 'there is a great gulf between us and you' (Lk 16,26), that is, as Chrysostom has it, a gulf between Abram and his father who is according to our preacher 'without faith' (ἄπιστος). The implication is clear: do not judge things according to 'present understanding' (νῦν ὑπόληψιν), and the clear proof of Abram doing this is the extent to which he entrusted his material circumstances to God while being a refugee or foreigner (ξένος) without home. 'Do not judge [κρῖνε] things ... nor suppose [νόμιζε] old age consists in ...' modulate Chrysostom's discourse to create what Stenger calls the epistemic function of defamiliarization.¹³⁶ Chrysostom makes obscure what would normally be clear, a reference to an old man's burial. But in Chrysostom's framework, the language of scripture possesses great treasure in such difficulties. The first step

134 Stenger, 'Text World', 229.

135 For instance, Origen, *Comm. Eph.* frag. 8,22 (*JThS* 3,242).

136 Stenger, 'Text Worlds', 228.

to attaining such treasures is to eschew what one takes as the surface judgement of things and looking rather for the spiritual lineage that connects the biblical characters and their actions.

Thus, the second major exegetical difficulty occurs to elaborate another aspect of God's character which defies human rationality, namely his capacity to forgive repentant sinners. Chrysostom is evidently aware that in the mention of a return from exile after four generations (or 400 years), a potential contradiction in biblical chronology occurs, as the later Exodus text mentions the exile occurs after the fifth generation (13,18). But more to Chrysostom's point, the generations enumerated in Ex 6 show that the exile ended after about 200 years. He introduces this question as an *aporia* formalized by an optative expression: 'At this point, however, someone might raise the difficulty [διαπορήσειε]' (346). It is difficult to assess just how detailed Chrysostom expected his audience to be on this point. The exegetical traditions dealing with these difficulties are diverse, but Chrysostom reproduces in considerable detail elements found also in the *Commentary on Genesis* of Eusebius of Emesa. Eusebius treats more directly the outright contradiction between Gen 15,16 (four generations) and Ex 13,18 (five generations). But he also treats Chrysostom's point about enumeration, the concern that the genealogy of Ex 6 is not, as Chrysostom puts it, 'half' (ἡμίση) that of 400 years. If we use Eusebius of Emesa as our gauge for what might be considered mature scholarship at the time, it follows that Chrysostom is not here short-circuiting a real difficulty, but rather representing (or selecting) one among several that fits best his purposes. It is useful to bear in mind further that in Late Antiquity, debates about calendar dating, biblical chronology, and typological symbols converged around the cultic representations of the Exodus Passover event in relation to the emerging Christian easter festival. The pilgrim journey of Egeria and the remarkable typological exegesis of Exodus 12 by Gregory of Nyssa are prime examples of this fruitful nexus in Chrysostom's context.¹³⁷ *Homily 37 on Genesis* likely follows the celebration of Easter by no more than two weeks.¹³⁸ Further, the proliferation of patristic exegetical traditions around these issues suggests that Chrysostom's problem is no trifling issue for his audience.

¹³⁷ M. Wallraff, 'Christliche Liturgie als religiöse Innovation in der Spätantike', in W. Kinzig et al. (eds.), *Liturgie und Ritual in der Alten Kirche. Patristische Beiträge zum Studium der gottesdienstlichen Quellen der Alten Kirche*, SPA 11 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 87; H.R. Drobner, 'Die Deutung des alttestamentlichen Pascha (Ex 12) bei Gregor von Nyssa im Lichte der Auslegungstradition der griechischen Kirche', in H.R. Drobner–Ch. Klock (eds.), *Studien zur Gregor von Nyssa und der christlichen Spätantike*, SVC 12 (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 273–296, esp. 282–292 for the complex patristic exegetical tradition.

¹³⁸ See Geiger, *Les homélies*, 25–26.

Chrysostom's answer, too, aligns with that of Eusebius of Emesa. They both offer a practical solution and a more theologically-based solution. Practically, one could begin the count of exile from the day of Abram's call when he was 75-years-old, the passage Chrysostom treats in *Homily 37 on Genesis*. More theologically, according to both Chrysostom and Eusebius, the marking of time here must be understood as emphasizing the longevity of God's patience and philanthropy, his endurance to fulfill his promises and restoration (ἀποκατάστασις, 346) of repentant sinners—here meaning the Amorites whose repentance God awaits in order to bring the children of Abram back into their promised land (Gen 15,16). By magnifying such munificence, Chrysostom is in a position to close the homily. He signals his intention to do so with a reiteration of his discourse modulations and main theme. The faith of Abram and Sarah teaches both the 'weakness' (ἀσθένειαν) of human nature and the greatness of God's power (δυνάμεως), a juxtaposition of opposites that recalls the 'power' or 'capacity' of the meaning of the biblical text.

He acknowledges, then, that 'lest we would stretch [ἐκτείνωμεν] our teaching again to great length, let us call to halt the development of our theme [ὑποθέσεως] at this point and bring the sermon to a close by urging you to become zealous [ὕμᾱς ζηλωτάς] for the patriarch' (PG 53.347; FOC 82.349, mod.). Both Abram's deeds and his words have illustrated all we need to know to obtain such divine favor, so it is logical to wish to hold him as an exemplar. Drawing together the themes of the homily, he asserts, 'Do you see [εἶδες] his unshakable faith [πίστιν]? Do you see his steady disposition [γνώμην]? Let us in turn imitate [μιμησώμεθα] this and go forth from the affairs of the present life with enthusiasm and eagerness, and travel [ὁδεύσωμεν] to heaven' (PG 53.348; FOC 82.350, mod.). Chrysostom thereby collapses the distance between text-world and audience, as he bids them to become refugees themselves, with heaven as their destination.¹³⁹ The imitation of Abram, then, is a firm faith in the power of God, which is shown precisely in circumstances where human reasoning would not think to look. The revision and application of patristic exegetical traditions have strengthened these points, showing God's longsuffering amidst exile and care to keep his promises from the very beginning of his calling. Picking up a regular concern of his, Chrysostom exhorts his audience to care not for extravagance of material clothing but to treat the soul this way and beautify it by resolving to be like Abram and Paul who eschewed greed. Further, he characterizes such dressers as despising of their fellow human beings and even

139 This element is missing from the otherwise helpful synthetic analysis of Tonia, *Abraham*, esp. 66–70 on the theme of Abraham's faith.

of Christ himself, who may himself be considered as naked (γυμνόν) (349), for they hardly consider the idea of distributing their riches and clothing to others, a hint at Chrysostom's regular recommendation to almsgiving.¹⁴⁰ 'True wealth' (ἀληθὴς πλοῦτος) the discourse concludes, would be to want only what is necessary (350). Chrysostom thereby returns to imagery of the *proæmium* in which the words of scripture themselves were envisaged as a hidden wealth. Using a series of images pertaining to riches and hiddenness on the one hand and contradiction and opposition on the other hand, Chrysostom creates a network of spiritual understandings of the biblical texts that is supported by exegetical difficulties and the pedagogical rhetoric that highlights them. The revelation of Christ as 'naked' among the poor of his audience's own social context is a brilliant final move that contrasts with the divine hidden in darkness, an image applied earlier to understanding Abram's faith in what is unseen.

7 Conclusion

We have seen that for John Chrysostom there was a complex relationship between approaching the biblical text for its mimetic value and the addressing of exegetical problems in the Old Testament. For while the text's 'meaning' or 'treasure' often envisaged the establishing of Chrysostom's stringent social expectations, these meanings have clear connections with real exegetical problems treated in the scholastic culture of his day. In works likely emerging from his Antiochene period, his *Homilies on Genesis* among them, John Chrysostom frequently, sometimes with remarkably consistency, raised these problems through the language of obscurity and clarity, or of hiddenness and treasure. As this language was basic to the task of biblical commentary developed in his day, Chrysostom's texts may be viewed as belonging in part to this practice. He selected the problem of potential contradictions as a major theme of his work, equipping his audience to understand his proposed solutions by placing them in reference to his spiritual ideals. Within this view, Chrysostom brought up negative evaluations of the Old Testament. Like other biblical commentators, he recognized that obscurity resulted from its translated character or from being a document originally written to the Jews. Christian commen-

¹⁴⁰ Excellent resources that capture the extent of Chrysostom's addressing this theme are S. Sitzler, 'Identity: The Indigent and the Wealthy in the Homilies of John Chrysostom', *VC* 63 (2009), 468–479 and W. Mayer, 'John Chrysostom on Poverty', in P. Allen et al. (eds.), *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity. Perceptions and Realities* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2009), 69–118.

tators offered various responses to these problems, various ways to clarify Old Testament texts. This context provides an important nuance to our understanding of Chrysostom's mimetic exegesis, as the case study of *Homily 37 on Genesis* brings out one such prescient problem resulting in potential contradiction around images and texts used to celebrate a major Christian festival. Chrysostom appears to discern a point worth raising from a whole cluster of problems around this potential contradiction, as the issue of measuring the time of the Israelite sojourning emphasized the spiritual pilgrimage to which he would call his audience and the mercy of God in bringing the pilgrimage to a close in coincidence with restoration and repentance. As we saw, Chrysostom raised this 'enumeration' difficulty with the language of *aporia*, which recalls the scholarly exegetical culture behind Christian instruction. To a closer examination of such language in his *Homilies on Genesis* we now turn.

Questions and Answers in Tradition and Practice

As part of the exegetical culture of early Christianity sketched in the introduction to this volume, patristic authors distinguished between legitimate and pernicious forms of inquiry. In the preface to his *Questions on the Octateuch*, Theodoret, writing in the middle of the fifth-century, mentions some people ‘impiously asking questions’ about the bible, hoping to show that it has ‘contradictions’ (ἐναντία).¹ Others, he says, ‘search [because they] love learning’ (φιλομαθῶς ζητοῦσι). Given the genre, we are not surprised to find him purpose his work for furnishing the latter with solutions to their inquiries. In another setting some years earlier, during his brief tenure as bishop of Constantinople, Gregory of Nazianzus had the occasion to attack what was for him a ‘quarrel of words’ (λογομαχία),² a Pauline term which Gregory understood to be dialectical disputation applied to trinitarian theology. Yet, like Theodoret writing a study of most of the Octateuch in the genre of questions-and-responses,³ later in the address Gregory turns to the dialectical method himself: ‘I would ask you just a bit ...’ (ἐρωτήσω σέ τι μικρόν).⁴ What characterized the appropriate form of inquiry for early Christian authors? ‘Meddlesome curiosity’, says Lim in commentary on Gregory’s shift, ‘was in the eye of the beholder’,⁵ implying that the criteria were the caprices of the interpreter. Following Wilken, Lim understands Gregory within a competitive environment of Late Antiquity in which authoritative figures used claims to knowledge, often in response to popularized ‘questioning’ of Trinitarian theological issues, in the structuring of their communities.⁶ The prohibition and permission to question set the boundaries of understanding and legitimized particular forms of communal identity.

1 Theodoret, *Q. Oct.* pro. 18–19 (LEC 1.4).

2 Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 27.1 (SC 250.70,7–8).

3 Guinot, ‘Les Questions’, 177.

4 Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 27.8 (SC 250.88–92).

5 R. Lim, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*, TCH 23 (Berkeley, CA–London: University of California Press, 1995), 163.

6 Lim, *Public Disputation*, 133–138 outlines ways in which some ecclesiastical authorities such as Amphilochius of Iconium ‘avoided’ questioning because it may ‘severely [compromise] one’s social standing among the educated’ (135); cf. Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 10–16 on the competitive environment of Late Antique Antioch.

That Chrysostom participated in this environment, especially in his own handling of controversial Trinitarian groups, is clear.⁷ But the way in which he responded to popularized questioning needs further exploration, and the exegetical questions-and-answers posed in the *Homilies on Genesis* provide us a precious vantage point in this regard. We know that in general he encouraged forms of biblical literacy amongst his audience, and sometimes he connected to this the insistence that his audience ‘dialogue’ with heretics using the intellectual tools provided by his own explanations of the bible.⁸ We know, more specifically, that Chrysostom often constructed knowledge according to absolute dichotomies of spatial rhetoric, such as that between the philosopher versus the monk or the fisherman,⁹ or the ‘outer philosopher’ versus our ‘inner’ philosophy, or as the ‘wide’ literature vs our ‘deep’ Scriptures seen in the case-study of the previous chapter.¹⁰ What role did questions-and-answer play in the construction of these boundaries? Lim has suggested that Chrysostom was unable to engage with sophistication those following the persuasive Eunomius in his native Antioch. So, our preacher declares that followers of Eunomius are ‘meddling’ (περιεργαζομένων) and ‘investigating’ (ζητούντας) into questions whose answers are impossible to discover.¹¹ From this vantage point it would seem that for Chrysostom ‘the asking of how and why—like the use of sophistic devices, syllogistic reasoning, and the posing of *zētēseis*—was not conducive to advancement in the faith’, a judgment echoed in other assessments of Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Genesis* in particular.¹²

7 Lim, *Public Disputation*, 171–177. Lim’s analysis is restricted to the homilies *On the Incomprehensibility of God*, likely delivered in Antioch.

8 J.L. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and His Congregation in Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 98–104; C. Aspesi, ‘Literacy and Book Ownership in the Congregations of John Chrysostom’, *StPatr* 67 (2013), 333–344.

9 Maxwell, *Christianization*, 32–36.

10 For the Late Antique background to the tradition of anti-intellectualism, see W. Mayer, ‘A Son of Hellenism: Viewing John Chrysostom’s Anti-Intellectualism through the Lens of Antiochene Paideia’, in S.-P. Bergjan–S. Elm (eds.), *Antioch II. The Many Faces of Antioch: Intellectual Exchange and Religious Diversity, CE 350–450*, COMES 3 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 369–390.

11 John Chrysostom, *De sacerdotibus* 4.5 (SC 272.263).

12 Lim, *Public Disputation*, 174; cf. Schäublin, ‘Zum paganen Umfeld der christlichen Predigt’, in E. Mühlenberg–J. van Oort (eds.), *Predigt in der alten Kirche* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), 32–33. Chrysostom is absent from this author’s *Untersuchungen*. In Baur, ‘Chrysostomus in Genesim’, 222, the *Homilies on Genesis* handle the biblical text with ‘phänomenale Leichtigkeit’; the whole article of Sandwell, ‘How to Teach’ extends this viewpoint.

What accounts, then, for Chrysostom bringing up in *Homily 14 on Genesis* 'the much debated question [πολυθρύλητον ζήτημα] about the tree?'¹³ A lengthy discussion follows concerning the relation between the creator's foreknowledge and his commands given in the garden of Eden. Again, in *Homily 28*, the same expression of 'the much debated question' occurs, this time about why one of Noah's sons is cursed for a crime committed by his father. Chrysostom describes it as being 'tossed about everywhere',¹⁴ and he addresses at length the problem of moral autonomy in the bible, which sometimes seems to suggest that sons bear the consequences of their fathers' errors. Chrysostom is not exaggerating when he says that these questions were well-known, as many Late Antique authors, pagan and Christian, witness them in similar terms. Particularly the problem of the tree in paradise and free will were identified by Basil of Caesarea, Eusebius of Caesarea, and (likely) Severian of Gabala with the exact same expression, 'much debated question'.¹⁵ Christians evidently borrowed this expression from pagan philology. A 'much debated question' (πολυθρύλητα ζητήματα) of textual criticism is known to the second-century B.C.E. Homeric scholar Aristarchus; some grammarians had inserted lines into the text of the Iliad to entrap Homer in poetic error.¹⁶ Porphyry, too, speaks about the problem of how God might imitate the human being as a 'much debated question'.¹⁷ Homiletic contexts were suitable for disputing questions with the terminology and techniques of textual commentary.

Chrysostom's approach to critical questions may thereby be stated with greater nuance by appreciating his handling of biblical exegetical questions-and-answers. Chrysostom did not envision questions as inimical to the soul's progression in knowledge of God, but rather as an integral aspect of his approach to the spiritual utility of the bible. It has been generally recognized, from Photius in the ninth-century to more recent scholars, that Chrysostom's homilies exhibit a style of question-and-answer; most recently, Molinié has noted their role in soliciting exegetical interrogations and staging a dialogue with his audience through specific cues signaling his responses ('As I would say ...').¹⁸ Yet most of these assessments have not viewed the form and con-

13 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 14.4 (PG 53.115; FOC 74.188).

14 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 28.4 (PG 53.257; FOC 82.192).

15 Basil of Caesarea, *Quod deus* 2 (PG 31.332b); Eusebius of Caesarea, *Hist. Eccl.* 5.27.1 (GCS 9/1.498,20–21); Severian (Ps.-Chrys.), *In fil. Prod.* 1 (PG 59.632).

16 *Schol. b in Il.* 20.253 (ERBSE, v:178); discussion of these Aristarchan 'questions' in W.J. Slater, 'Aristophanes of Byzantium and Problem-Solving in the Museum', *CQ* 32.2 (1982), 337 n. 8 and Gudeman, 'Αύσεις', 2514.

17 Porphyry, *Quaest. Hom. ad Il.* 18,591–592 (TK 36.232).

18 In his remarks on the *Homilies on Genesis*, Photius, *Bibl.* 172–174 (HENRY, 11:168) notes that

tent of his questions posed to biblical texts in their exegetical environment, even though Mitchell established that the question-and-answer format was part of his ‘necromantic’ exegesis, as he posed to Paul questions like ‘what are you saying’, and procured answers about the texts from there.¹⁹ Because this kind of ‘necromantic’ address is rare in the *Homilies on Genesis*, we can learn more about Chrysostom’s rhetorical-exegesis by attending to the forms of questions posed therein. Further, the *Homilies on Genesis* witness a rich dossier of material that, from a comparative perspective, demonstrates that his questions derived from scholarly patristic exegetical traditions as developed in his day.

1 Disputing Exegetical Questions in Other Christian Homilies

John Chrysostom is clearly not the originator of the application of the technique of posing exegetical ‘questions’ to homiletic contexts, and before turning to our analysis of Chrysostom’s questions in the *Homilies on Genesis*, we illustrate the widespread practice of disputing biblical exegetical questions in the format of a homily intended for public delivery in other Greek Christian homilists around Chrysostom’s day. Some did not involve extensive discussion of literary problems but were focused directly on the spiritual value of a given narrative. A clear example of this occurs in Gregory of Nyssa’s oration commemorating the 40 martyrs of Sebaste. Having narrated the events of their brutal, cold martyrdom by interweaving biblical passages to illustrate the gravity of the situation, he turns to argue that by their Christ-like death the martyrs have entered paradise. But based on Gen 3,24 which mentions an angel holding a revolving sword outside the gates of paradise, there is a problem (τὸ μὲν οὖν ζητούμενον). Or, rather, it is several: ‘is, because of the revolving sword, Paradise inaccessible, even to the saints? And, are the athletes also excluded from Paradise ... And will they then have less than the robber to whom the Lord said: “Today you will be with me in Paradise [Lk 23,43]”?’²⁰ ‘The question [ζήτημα],’ he goes on, ‘entails its solution [λύσιν].’²¹ the sword turns like a revolving door,

they frequently contain question (ἐρωτᾷ) and response (ἀποκρίνεται); Kamesar, *Jerome*, 93; Cook, *Preaching*, 63, and H. Jordan, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1911), 410, note in passing that Chrysostom uses the procedure of questions-and-answers; Molinié, *Jean Chrysostome*, 160–165.

19 Mitchell, *Heavenly Trumpet*, 32.

20 Gregory of Nyssa, *In XL mart.* II, GNO 10/1.156,1–6 (LEEMANS, 107).

21 Gregory of Nyssa, *In XL mart.* II, GNO 10/1.156,11–12 (LEEMANS, 107); Alexandre, ‘L’épée de flamme’, 430–431, outlines features of how Greek Christian authors dealt with this problem of ‘passing over’ the obstacle of the sword through citing various biblical texts to dramatize the imagery of entering the guarded paradise.

enabling those permitted to gain entrance. Notably, like many of Chrysostom's questions, Gregory's here concerns coherence of two disparate plains of comprehension, such as that between Old and New Testaments or that between the New Testament and fourth-century *realia*. The martyrs, having made their confession, are worthy to enter; may we too, says Gregory, aspire to such a confession. Gregory raised these questions, developed widely in patristic exegetical traditions, to make the biblical text cohere with his conception of spiritual progress.

In several cases, questions in homiletic contexts draw upon issues of slightly more technical biblical study and sustained commentary. For instance, in his *Homily 13 on Luke*, Origen uses the formula 'but someone might ask in this place' (ἀλλὰ ζητῆσαι τις ἂν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ) to frame an apparent contradiction: on the one hand there is the Jesus who, as Mt 10,34 has it, 'Came not for peace, but the sword'; on the other hand, there is the Jesus whose coming is announced by angels as, with Luke, 'Peace on earth' (Lk 2,14).²² A Cappadocian sermon contemporary with Chrysostom also addressed this contradiction.²³ Perrone's study found that when the terminology of questions-and-answers is used to discuss a problem in the text, Origen almost always answers with literal interpretations.²⁴ In these cases, his goal is often to protect the biblical text from contradiction, inconsistency, or absurdity, as we have already seen is the case for Chrysostom in his *Homily 37 on Genesis*. The *Homilies on the Psalms* from the Munich codex bear out this observation. Noticing that Ps 148,1–2 enjoins the praise of the 'heavens', the 'powers', and the 'dragons of the abyss', Origen admits that taken literally, these poetic expressions required that 'I was frequently asking' (πολλάκις ἐζήτουν) about their meaning.²⁵ In what follows, he explains that these terms are spoken 'homonymous' (ὁμωνύμως) against a metaphysical background: the powers and dragons are angels. Literary critical study is thereby found in Origen's homilies in the form of questions-and-answers: internal coherence of narrative, consistency of linguistic expression, the referents of bizarre terms, questions of appropriate conceptions of deity. In at least one case in Origen's work, the *Homily on the Witch of Endor*, the entire homily is structured according to questions and their responses.²⁶

22 Origen, *Hom. In Luc.* 13 (GCS 49.79,3–4).

23 S. Kim, '«Je suis venu jeter du feu sur la terre»: l'édition critique de l'original grec et de la version arménienne d'une homélie du Pseudo-Chrysostome cappadocien (CPG 4669)', *SE* 57 (2018), 117–166.

24 Perrone, 'Perspectives', 160–162.

25 Origen, *Hom. in Ps. LXXVI* 3,2 (GCS NF 19.332,8–333,6).

26 Bardy, 'La littérature patristique', 225–227; M.M. Mitchell in R.A. Greer–M.M. Mitchell,

Another example of sustained exegesis in homilies via questions-and-answers emerges in the case of Severian of Gabala's *Homily 6 on the Creation*, likely delivered in Constantinople several years after Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis*.²⁷ Exhorting his audience in the beginning to learn from the Scripture 'the answer of the questions' (τῶν ἀπορουμένων τὴν λύσιν),²⁸ he sets the stage for an entire discourse inspired by problems regarding the serpent and the temptation of Adam and Eve to eat from the Tree mentioned in Gen 2,17. The objection, as he understands it, stems from 'those following Porphyry'. Severian's discussion of the problem resembles those mentioned in Titus of Bostra's treatise *Against the Manichaeans*, as well as the *Commentary on Genesis* of Eusebius of Emesa and that of Diodore.²⁹ Severian's case illustrates the convergence of

The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor. Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, WGRW 16 (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2007), XCIII; CXXV–CXXXVIII.

27 R. Carter, 'The Chronology of Twenty Homilies of Severian of Gabala', *Traditio* 55 (2000), 16–17.

28 Severian of Gabala, *De mundi creatione* 6.1 (PG 56.484).

29 Severian of Gabala, *De mundi creatione* 6.3 (PG 56.487) is the famous text that mentions 'those following the impious Porphyry's writing against the Christians' (οἱ τῷ θεοστυγεῖ Πορφυρίῳ ἀκολουθήσαντες τῷ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν συγγράψαντι), and a subsequent objection to the Genesis text, namely that it indicates mankind did not originally have knowledge of good and evil. While a rare occasion in which Porphyry's *Against the Christians* is actually named, and Severian appears to offer quotations, we are not dealing with the *ipsissima verba* of the treatise. See discussion in J.G. Cook, 'Porphyry's Critique of the Jewish Scriptures: Three New Fragments', in S. Kreuzer et al. (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte. 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 22.–25. Juli 2010*, WUNT 286 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 564–566 and Morlet, 'Pourquoi Dieu', 138–139. Morlet, 'Pourquoi Dieu', 141 (cf. 140 n. 113) has suggested that the common source is possibly Origen's *Commentary on Genesis*, pace G. Rinaldi, *La Bibbia dei pagani*, La Bibbia nella storia 19 (Bologna: Ed. Dehoniane, 1998), 11:89 and R.M. Grant, 'The Stromateis of Origen', in Fontaine–Kannengiesser (eds.), *Epektasis*, 285–292 where the suggestions are that Porphyry responds generally to Origen or to Apelles. The inclusion of this as a 'fragment' in the edition Porphyry, *C. Christ.* fr. 47f (TK 52.304) should thereby be cautioned.

Similar discussions concerning free will, the serpent's natural abilities, and the Creator's jealousy occur in Titus of Bostra, *C. Man.* 3.7 (CCSG 82.251), Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 20a–p (TEG 15.58–70), and Diodore, *Coisl.* 70 (CCSG 15.67–68). Diodore also composed an 18-book work against the Manichaeans, now lost. A fragment, however, was discovered in an anonymous florilegium of *Codex Vatopedi* 236, edited and studied by G. Malavasi, 'Diodore of Tarsus' Treatise Against the Manichaeans: A New Fragment', VC 69.3 (2015) 296–304. N.A. Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof in Defence of God. A Study of Titus of Bostra's Contra Manichaeos. The Work's Sources, Aims, and Relation to its Contemporary Theology*, NHMS 56 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 371–382 contains a detailed analysis that shows much in common between the exegesis of Gen 2,17 from Titus, Diodore, and Eusebius. Titus frames his discussion in the text cited above with the term ἐπαπορών. This and similar

commentary, pagan apologetics, and homily that we explored in the first chapter of this volume. This is precisely the question Chrysostom raises when he comes to Gen 2,17 and recognizes it as ‘the much debated question about the tree’. Even though we have not specified exactly how the exegetical question always cohered with the wider rhetorical purposes, which I shall return to later in the case of Chrysostom, these cases suffice to demonstrate that disputing exegetical questions in the context of a homily or discourse formed a part of what Lim called ‘public disputation’ in Late antiquity.

Before visiting the connection in detail, it is worth surveying the extent to which the questions-and-answers format penetrated Chrysostom’s formulations and expression throughout the *Homilies on Genesis*. As Appendix 1 shows, zetetic and aporia terminologies occur consistently throughout the entire series, and the content of these questions relate directly to other patristic exegetical traditions. This suggests a considerable degree of scholarly learning behind Chrysostom’s *Genesis* homilies.

2 Posing Questions in the *Homilies on Genesis*

A useful starting point for exploring the questions-and-answers procedure in Chrysostom’s works as we have them should begin with the terms ‘question’ (ζήτημα) or ‘problem’ (ἀπορία) and their verbal forms. There is for Chrysostom no clear distinction between these two at the level of content: he uses them interchangeably to bring up critical exegetical points to discuss, many of them potential contradictions, and to invite his audience to view the meaning of the text in relation to his wider rhetorical purposes. In John Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Genesis*, these terms occur 24 times for exegetical purposes, widespread from *Homily* 2 up to *Homily* 67. In the table of Appendix 1, I collect these cases, provide Hill’s English translation of the passage in which they occur, and provide parallels to previous or contemporary sources in which similar exegetical questions occur (not always with the marker of ζήτημα, ἀπορία, or *quaestio*). As concerns the *Homilies on Genesis*, there is a concentration in *Homily* 16, which deals with three *zētēmata* related to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen 3,1–7). Another concentration of the vocabulary occurs in *Homilies* 28–29,

cases led Pedersen to assert that at notable points the treatise ‘takes on a certain similarity with the contemporary Christian *quaestiones*-genre’ (253). While Pedersen may overstate the relationship of this work to the literary genre of questions-and-answers, the parallel of the content and form to that found in the context of Antiochene biblical exegetical works is instructive for our purposes.

in which he deals with five *zētēmata* related to Noah's life after the flood leading up to his death (Gen 9,21–29). After this text Chrysostom's use of *zētēmata* vocabulary wanes: only seven cases in the 38 remaining homilies. Ten of the 24 *zētēmata* as such occur in the first 18 homilies, which cover Genesis 1–3. There are scores of exegetical questions besides those framed in this terminology, but their use bears special attention.

Most of Chrysostom's invocations of a ζήτημα, more frequently used than ἀπορία in the *Homilies on Genesis*, involve a metaphorical construction. Five times we find questions 'engendered' (τίκτειν / ἐπιφύειν).³⁰ On another five counts questions 'arise' (ἀνακύπτειν).³¹ These and similar formulations are well-known throughout early Christian biblical exegetes. For instance, in a catena fragment,³² Origen uses an 'engendered' question to wonder if Paul 'contradicts himself' (ἐναντιοῦσθαι).³³ Diodore expressed that a question 'moves in' (ἐκινεῖτο) concerning why Noah's grandson Canaan is cursed for the sin of his father Cham.³⁴ Theodoret knows that exegetical questions can 'appear for the mind' (ἀναπτύξαι τὸν νοῦν) of the text.³⁵

30 *In Gen. hom.* 2.2 (PG 53.27); 9.4 (53.78); 16.5 (53.131); 17.9 (53.147); 28.4 (53.257); cf. *Ad pop. Ant.* 16.4 (PG 49.165–166); *In epist. 1 ad Tim.* 9 (EP 6.71e), on Gen 3,6–16.

31 *In Gen. hom.* 11.7 (PG 53.89); 16.5 (53.132); 24.6 (53.213); 44.4 (53.411).

32 There is a potential problem in adducing fragments from the *catenae* as support for my argumentation. Simply put, it is always possible that it is the catenist himself who added the formulas in question. However, the vantage point provided by Eusebius of Emesa's *Commentary on Genesis* lends support to a cautious inclusion of *catenae* material. While it cannot be applied *mutatis mutandis* to ensure the validity of all *catenae* traditions regarding this question, a comparison between his full Armenian commentary on Genesis with the fragments preserved in the Greek *catenae* from this work shows that the Genesis catenist produces the 'question' formulas faithfully to Eusebius' original in many cases. Discussion is in ter Haar Romeny, *A Syrian*, 13, who follows the initial impression of Devreesse. On the reverse side, Schaublin, *Untersuchungen*, 49, convinced that the commentary of Diodore was written after the format of questions-and-answers, raised the possibility that the catenist's method of extraction often involved deleting the statement of the *zētēma* in the original commentary. For him this explained why many of Diodore's fragments on Genesis, which survive in the now critically edited *Collectio Coisliniana* and *catenae* traditions, lack *zētēma* and *aporiai* terminology. Ter Haar Romeny explained this as 'hidden *zētēma*'; cf. Petit, 'La Chaîne grecque', 243–245.

33 Origen, *Comm. Rom.* 41,1 (*JThS* 14.15); also in Theodore, *Cat. ad Rom.* 8,5–6 (STAAB 134,26); John Chrysostom, *Exp. In Ps. cxiii* 2 (PG 55.307); Severian of Gabala, *apud Cat. ad Acta* 2,16 (CGPNT 3.32,9).

34 Diodore, *Coisl.* 164,2 (CCSG 15.161). Devreesse, *Commentateurs grecs*, 155 n. 4, lists the 16 uses of *zētēma* terminology in the Deconinck's edition of Diodore's fragments, which lead Devreesse to conclude that Diodore's *Commentary on the Octateuque* was not continuous commentary but a work of questions-and-answers.

35 Theodoret, *Q. Gen.* pro. 3 (LEC 1.2); see further Guinot, 'Les Questions', 182–183; 188–190.

In the *Homilies on Genesis*, Chrysostom also expressed that questions are ‘worthy’ (ἄξιον).³⁶ Patristic exegetes regularly addressed questions this way, such as Didymus wondering whether Abraham ‘seeing’ God (Gen 12,1) meant that he saw God’s invisible nature.³⁷ For Chrysostom, many of these formulas are accompanied by ‘here’ (ἐνταῦθα), by which he indicates the specific biblical text at hand.³⁸ Of course, not all question formulas regarding exegetical topics were introduced with metaphorical expressions. Again, this fits a general pattern amongst other Late Antique Christian exegetes: Diodore knows that ‘this word is a problem’;³⁹ the fragments of Origen and Eusebius of Emesa often begin a lemmatic comment with an inquiry (ζητεῖται) and a question formula (+ εἰ, διὰ τί, or πῶς).⁴⁰ In his *Homilies on Genesis*, then, Chrysostom adapts established formulations for raising critical questions in biblical exegetical scholarship in Late Antiquity.

Synonymous with *zētēma* and *aporia* for Chrysostom is the verb ‘to search out’ (διερευνῆσαι), which relates to the verb in one of his favorite proof texts for framing scriptural study, John 5,39. ‘If you search out ... then you will find’, Chrysostom says, trying to prove that the *hexaemeron* of Genesis narrates the formation of each created thing in a way that contradicts human reason.⁴¹ Or, when the eyes of Adam and Eve are ‘opened’ *post lapsum*, ‘to search out with accuracy [ἀκριβείας]’ will yield ‘the things hidden [κεκρυμμένων] in the depth [βάθει]’.⁴² Chrysostom’s imagery for deploying exegetical questions-and-answers relates to the rhetoric of obscurity, difficulty, and treasure explored in Chapter 1. Inscriptions or headings, such as those of the Psalms or the title of Acts, are addressed with ‘questioning’ (ζητῆσαι), from which one would ‘find treasure’ (θησαυρὸν εὑρη).⁴³ We gather ‘the little shavings’ (τὰ μικρὰ ψήγματα), such as in a homily on Isa 6,1 in Antioch, where Chrysostom affirms that treasure is available for those ‘questioning’ (ζητοῦσι) matters such as the date and

36 John Chrysostom, 2.2 (PG 53.27) + διαπορήσαι; 12.1 (53.99); 26.4 (53.235); 28.4 (53.256); 29.3 (53.264); 49.1 (54.445).

37 Didymus, *In Gen.* 216,21 (SC 244.156). For examples in Origen, see *In Jo.* 6.150.1 (SC 157.242) and *Cat.* 1205 (TEG 3.190), with discussion Perrone, ‘Perspectives’, 157 n. 25.

38 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 16.2 (PG 53.127).

39 Diodore, *Coisl.* 174,12 (CCSG 15.169).

40 E.g. Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 760 (TEG 2.160); 873 (ibid., 221); 902 (TEG 3.19); 1181 (ibid., 178). Origen, *Cat.* 688 (TEG 2.117).

41 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 12.3 (PG 53.101).

42 Ibid., 18.3 (PG 53.151). Another example is Noah’s animals, ibid., 24.5 (PG 53.213).

43 John Chrysostom, *In prin. Acta* 1.3 (PG 51.71): ‘It is useful to inquire [ζητῆσαι χρῆ] after this, why does it have this epigraph [ἐπιγραφὴν] “The Acts of the Apostles”’; Mayer, *Provenance*, 511, for Antiochene provenance.

location of a text. Over these we must not pass hastily.⁴⁴ A call for a kind of research into the historical context of king Uzziah's reign mentioned in Isa 6,1 combines with the treasure-seeking metaphor.

In this vein, in the *Homilies on Genesis* a 'difficulty' (δυσκολία) on Noah and the flood contains a treasure about which the audience must 'search out' (ζητήσαι).⁴⁵ At times, Chrysostom's use of questions terminology is less straightforward about an exegetical difficulty *per se*, yet still shows a clear link to the task of Scriptural interpretation in general and the call on his audience to comprehend his teaching. This is a crucial angle from which to view the integrality of rhetoric and exegesis in his works. So, for Chrysostom, the grace of the Holy Spirit will enable us to make a 'finding' (εὑρεσιν) 'of the things sought' (ζητούμενων).⁴⁶ The invocation of the Holy Spirit in the task of interpretation is an important perspective on the wider spiritual ramifications which Chrysostom believed inherent in his task. In another case, we must confront the seeming contradiction between Gen 2,3, which says that God rested, and John 5,17, which suggests that God is always at work. 'A question arises to us here', he continues, 'A yawning sea of meanings is produced upon our thoughts [νοημάτων]', raising the inadmissible possibility that Scripture contradicts itself.⁴⁷ Notice the markers for his audience here: the question is posed 'to us' and the sea imposes on 'our' thoughts; Chrysostom uses questions-and-answers to dramatize the exegetical content of his discourse and produce meanings that connect with a noetic plane.

As Lim pointed out, however, not all researching is advisable, for it can undermine orthodox trinitarian dogma. Indeed, for Chrysostom, 'word-fighting and searching' (λογομαχίας καὶ ζητήσεις) are the tools of those who want to subordinate the Son to the Father, based on the insertion of the word 'Lord' (κύριος) in Gen 2,15 next to 'God'. The Father alone, so goes the argument as reported by Chrysostom, is Lord as such, and so he alone placed man in the garden.⁴⁸ But 1 Cor 8,6 proves that the bible means no such thing, Chrysostom reassures his audience. For in this Pauline text the Son receives the same title, 'Lord'. For the context of a popular sermon, handling this 'question' is a relatively complex matter, as he specifies his argument with a proof text and a careful distinction involving names therein. This discussion closely resembles Gregory of Nyssa's

44 John Chrysostom, *In Oz. hom.* 2.2.49–50, 66–70 (SC 277.94–95).

45 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 28.8 (PG 53.251).

46 *Ibid.*, 14.1 (PG 53.111).

47 *Ibid.*, 11.7 (PG 53.89).

48 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 14.2 (PG 53.112–113).

exposition of 1 Cor 8,6's 'Lord' in his treatise *Against Eunomius*.⁴⁹ Thus, concerning Trinitarian theology, precisely the point at which Lim judged Chrysostom to be closed-minded,⁵⁰ he engages in part a learned discussion. However, it must be admitted that Lim's portrait of Chrysostom's approach to questioning holds true in other cases. He wonders in *Homily 21 on Genesis*: to where was Enoch taken (Gen 5,24)? Response: Research into such a thing is to meddle or curiously inquire (περιεργάζεσθαι; πολυπραγμονεῖν).⁵¹ Further, when God commands things to multiply (Gen 1,28), Chrysostom is certain that one should not 'inquire' (ζήτη) into how this works after the fashion of human procedures.⁵² Resorting to such accusations comports well with how Theodoret viewed certain inquiries, namely that they were impious, seeking to find problems in scripture and exploit them for advancing the view that it is full of contradictions. Yet his choice not to engage certain exegetical difficulties must be placed within the backdrop of the many other places in which he does precisely the opposite. This uneven approach suggests an extensive adaptability of patristic exegetical traditions to envisaged particular auditory contexts. The extent of this adaptation is best viewed from the perspective of the case study at the end of this chapter. But other important elements include the posing of questions via formulas not explicitly involving the verbal or noun forms of 'questions' or 'difficulties' terminology.

3 Variant Question Formulas

In their studies of patristic exegetical works composed in the questions-and-answers genre, Guinot and Zamagni identified recurring formulations such as διὰ τί, τί δήποτε, and πῶς—just as the scholia of Aristotelian commentary.⁵³ We may add that based on fragments from the *Collectio Coisliniana*, Origen's *Commentary on Genesis* seems to exhibit similar features,⁵⁴ as is the case for Euse-

49 Gregory of Nyssa, *C. Eun.* 1.395–397 (GNO 1.142–143), 1.548 (ibid., 185); cf. John Chrysostom, *Incomp.* 5,74–95 (SC 28^{bis}, 276–278).

50 Lim, *Public Disputation*, 130–144.

51 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 21.4 (PG 53.181; FOC 82.60).

52 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 28.5 (PG 53.258; FOC 82.193).

53 Guinot, 'Les Questions', 182–190; C. Zamagni, 'Existe-t-il une terminologie technique dans les Questions d'Eusèbe de Césarée?', in A. Volgers–C. Zamagni (eds.), *Erotapokriseis. Early Christian Question-and-Answer Literature in Context*, CBET 37 (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 94–96.

54 Origen, *Coisl.* 160,1 (CCSG 15.156).

bis of Emesa in the *catenae*.⁵⁵ Such formulations, easily dismissed, become an important part of John Chrysostom's exegetical procedure, suggesting an artful approach to regularly posing questions about biblical texts in his *Homilies on Genesis*.

Most frequently, in his *Homilies on Genesis*, Chrysostom raises questions of causal representation in the narrative. 'Why, then' or 'For what did this happen' is the general meaning of these formulations, occurring hundreds of times over.⁵⁶ So, after introducing the concept of fasting to his audience, our preacher remarks that someone 'with sharp vision' (ὁξὺ βλέπόντων) may wonder 'why' Jesus fasts for the same amount of time as his disciples (Mt 4,2), showing again his concern for addressing apparent contradictions.⁵⁷ Sometimes these formulations appear with zetetic terminology, such as 'one might ask why' (ζητήσκει· τίνας ἔνεχεν) Lot was taken into captivity after fleeing from Sodom (Gen 14,13–16).⁵⁸ To achieve clarity in argument development and precision on the words which he wishes to comment, Chrysostom adjoins response expressions, such as 'since', 'because,' and verbs such as 'so that you might learn'.⁵⁹ At the formal level, then, elements of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* resemble the terse and precise nature of patristic questions-and-answers and the Hellenistic scholia.⁶⁰ Such linguistic signals set mental markers for details in the narrative upon which Chrysostom will enlarge for his *paraenesis*, a point which I demonstrate fully in a case study at the end of this chapter. Presently, it suffices to note their abundance and consistency, even with lengthy and redundant formulas like 'for the sake of what and why', across the *Homilies on Genesis*.

Other formulas occurred to achieve specific attention on individual words and expressions in the biblical text. Occurring over 80 times is variation on the formula 'what [therefore] does this [word / thing] mean?' (τί [οὖν] ἐστὶν [τό]). He often immediately follows these with answers, sometimes without any introductory formula, sometimes with 'instead of' (ἀντὶ τοῦ) (I return to these points presently and in Chapter 4). Chrysostom thus uses this formula to steer his audience's focus to the words of the text at hand and prepare them to receive the explanation in what follows. The issues clearly pertain to exegetical difficulties, such as a potential contradiction between the location of Abram's

55 Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 901 (TEG 3.18), 1197 (ibid., 186), 1214 (ibid., 196), 1840 (TEG 4.204).

56 The most notable are found as διὰ τοῦτο (+ 200×), τίνας ἔνεχεν (+100×), διὰ τί (+ 58×), τίνας ἔνεχεν καὶ διὰ τί (14×), and τί δήποτε (1×).

57 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 1.3 (PG 53.24; FOC 74.25).

58 Ibid., 35.4 (PG 53.326).

59 E.g. ibid., 21.1 (PG 53.176); 33.1 (53.307); 41.2 (53.376); 46.3 (54.426).

60 Guinot, 'Les Questions', 188–189 on τί δήποτε; Zamagni, 'Terminologie', 89.

calling given in Acts 7,2–4 and Gen 11,31–32: ‘What does this mean, then? Does Scripture contradict itself [ἐναντιοῦται ἑαυτῇ]? By no means!’⁶¹ On other occasions the formula is used to announce a famous problem, the coats of skin: ‘What is this, then [τί οὖν]? Do you command us to wear coats of skins?’ he says, regarding Gen 3,21, a text of some urgency for anthropological and eschatological discussions.⁶²

Alongside these expressions is the use of ‘what does it wish [to say],’ Τί βούλεται (10×). In his *Questions on the Octateuch*, Theodoret uses this expression and others such as ‘what does it signify’ (τί σημαίνει or τί δηλοῖ). Often, Guinot says, Theodoret used these to go beyond the letter of the text in search of its hidden sense.⁶³ For Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Genesis* it has similar exegetical value, but he tends to use it for focusing on the literal text, referencing the words themselves, so combining it with ‘the thing said’ (τὸ εἰρημένον) or ‘the accommodation of the letter’ (τῆς λέξεως ἡ συγκατάβασις). So too in Eusebius of Emesa, for whom it occasionally functions as a paraphrase formulation. When faced with the convoluted expression in the LXX Gen 28,21, ‘If the Lord brings me to come back,’ Eusebius says that ‘Jacob means to say [βούλεται] “If I return”’.⁶⁴ For Chrysostom, ‘what’ the text ‘wishes’ (τί βούλεται) to say invokes a vivid image from the combined chastity stories of Rebecca (Gen 25,19–25) and Mary (Lk 1,31–35): ‘the choir [χορός] of virgins, what does it mean?’⁶⁵ Small though it may be, he can wonder ‘what does this same tiny word want to say,’ meaning the ‘particle’ (σύνδεσμον) ‘but’ (δέ).⁶⁶ A considerable theological-scholastic discussion follows.

The same patterns for signaling meaning and specifying a text occur regarding several other expressions, such as his posing the text as something ‘strange’ (καίνον) or ‘foreign’ (ξένον). This is an effective way of creating tension between the familiar and the unfamiliar and creating contrasts which enable his answer to resonate with the confidence of truth. Again, when dealing with the making of man (Gen 1,26–28), he is not surprised by the fact that mankind is brought out last. But clearly some may take it as such. He asks, ‘What is strange, what is foreign?’⁶⁷ In fact, the sequence of the creation account, and man’s final place within it, is a question ‘suitably’ (εἰκότως) posed, he admits, and about it ‘we

61 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 31.3 (PG 53.286).

62 Ibid., 18.2 (PG 53.150).

63 Guinot, ‘*Les Questions*’, 189.

64 Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 1516 (TEG 3.380), also in *Cat.* 2248 (TEG 4.442).

65 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 49.1 (PG 54.445).

66 Ibid., 15.1 (PG 53.119).

67 Ibid., 8.2 (PG 53.71; FOC 74.107).

may ask the Jew' (ἐρώμεθα τὸν Ἰουδαῖον). By Chrysostom's time, the problem had a considerably developed text-referent web; already Philo had raised this exact question as a *zētēma* among Alexandrian scholars.⁶⁸ Chrysostom's flexible formulations for asking and answering questions thereby also include the discussion of traditional *zētēmata* in biblical scholarship.

Another means of invoking questions and sources in his *Homilies on Genesis*, as Molinié has noted similarly for his *Homilies on 2 Corinthians*, is 'some are saying' (λέγουσι γὰρ τινες and τινές φασι).⁶⁹ Like in Eusebius of Emesa, 'some say' may bring up the opinions or 'hidden *zētēmata*' of imagined or posed interlocutors, such as the Greeks or Bardesanes.⁷⁰ But Eusebius does not always make the identity of his interlocutors explicit. In a representative case, 'some say' that a man named Damaskos Eliezar was the servant of Abraham.⁷¹ With this terse, scholia-like comment, Eusebius proceeds no further. While he does not ask a question, the 'some say' formula brings up the implicit question of who is this Damaskos Eliezar figure. For Chrysostom, uses of 'some say' formulas bring up silent interlocutors that informed his knowledge of how to ask critical questions of the bible. So, while he often does not attribute to these 'certain ones' an actual question or *zētēma*, mentioning a τινες with a clear opinion accomplishes the same rhetorical result as a question. There are 'some who say' that God restricts Noah's dietary regimen in Gen 9,4 to 'hard' meat. 'Some' serves as a marker for his audience's attention; the implicit question is of what, precisely, did God's dietary commands consist? For Chrysostom the 'hard' meat idea is too scientific (φιλοσοφώτερον) and he comes up with his own opinion. In fact, Diodore held that it was this 'hard' meat,⁷² suggesting that Chrysostom is here addressing and rejecting the opinion of his mentor in an exegetical disputation format within his homily.⁷³ The form of 'some say' brings us to the second half of a questions-and-answer exegetical procedure, as such formulas were steering mechanisms for Chrysostom to present his own answers.

68 Philo, *Opif.* 77 (OPA 1.25,23): 'It is obvious to inquire why [ἐπιζητήσει δ' ἂν τις τὴν αἰτίαν] man comes last in the world's creation'. See M. Niehoff, 'Homeric Scholarship and Bible Exegesis in Ancient Alexandria: Evidence from Philo's "Quarrelsome" Colleagues', *CQ* 57.1 (2007), 169; for analysis of Philo's didactic environment, S.A. Adams, 'Philo's *Questions* and the Adaptation of Greek Philosophical Curriculum', in J. Zurawski–G. Boccaccini (eds.), *Second Temple Jewish Paideia in Context*, BZNW 228 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017), 167–184.

69 Molinié, *Jean Chrysostome*, 280.

70 Ter Haar Romeny, *A Syrian*, 15.

71 Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 945 (TEG 3.44).

72 Diodore, *Coisl.* 203 (CCSG 15.198).

73 Full analysis of this passage is in Chapter 5.

The eclectic and adaptable formulas Chrysostom used to pose questions captured a wide range of metaphorical images and connoted the addressing of specific exegetical difficulties. These ranged from word paraphrases to traditional *zētēmata* and encompassed his ability to operate dialogue among diverse patristic exegetical opinions, sometimes with a critical and revisionary posture. Because it is essential to his rhetorical procedure, then, Chrysostom's articulation of his own answers to questions which he poses deserves greater scrutiny.

4 Providing Answers

Just as 'some say' could invoke a question, so too could it invoke the voice of a dialectical answer. 'What is the sign' of the arc in the sky after the flood (Gen 9,12–13), Chrysostom wonders. It is a rainbow, which 'some say' (τινές φασι) is made through the sun shining on the clouds.⁷⁴ Eusebius of Emesa offers an explanation which resembles the form and content of Chrysostom's question and its answer here, and the Emesene too cites a source ('we know' [οἶδαμεν]), indicating a common resource from which the two exegetes could draw their explanation of this natural phenomenon.⁷⁵ For his part, Eusebius of Emesa also brings up other exegetical opinions through 'certain people say that' (λέγουσιν τινες ὅτι) or 'they say' (οἱ μὲν φασιν).⁷⁶ The presence of 'some' who hold Chrysostom's opinions thereby lend his own answers greater weight, and like Eusebius of Emesa, Chrysostom often elides the explicitly stated question and its answer into an abstract representative.⁷⁷ Other uses indicate a largely negative connotation for Chrysostom's τινες. There are 'certain narrations' (μυθολογίας τινάς) and 'some arrogant commentators' (τινες τῶν ἐπὶ εὐγλωττίᾳ μεγαλοφρονούντων) who in reference to Gen 2,8 speculate on the other-worldly location of paradise.⁷⁸ As in Eusebius of Emesa, Chrysostom speaks of 'Greeks saying' ("Ἕλληνες λέγοντες) that the bible's view on man as lord over the beasts is inaccurate.⁷⁹ Chrysostom also explicitly connects these 'some' with his *zētēmata* formulas: 'Some are inquiring' (ζήτησίν τινα) whether God's curse of death upon Adam

74 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 28.2 (53.254).

75 Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 778 (TEG 2.172). Procopius does not witness this text, but it is confirmed by the Armenian in *Comm. Gen.* 50a on Gen 9,13 (TEG 15.100).

76 E.g., *ibid.*, *Cat.* 237 (TEG 1.167); 781 (TEG 2.174); 945 (TEG 3.44); 954 (*ibid.*, 50).

77 Ter Haar Romeny, *A Syrian*, 15.

78 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 13.3 (PG 53.108; FOC 74.175); for a survey of the patristic interpretations of this issue, see Alexandre, 'Entre ciel et terre' and full discussion in Chapter 8.

79 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 9.3–4 (PG 53.78).

and Eve after their sin (Gen 3,17–19) was ineffective or contradictory to the rest of the narrative.⁸⁰ Similarly, Didymus the Blind reveals that ‘some are inquiring’ (ζητοῦσίν τινες) where the water of the flood goes when the catastrophe dissipates (Gen 8,2).⁸¹ Chrysostom’s adaptation of answer formulas revolving around ‘some say / question’, then, follows standard conventions for how to study a text by bringing up interpretations which one may modify, accept, or reject.

Of the 24 cases in which Chrysostom explicitly raises *zētēmata* (Appendix 1), he does not often frame his solutions in terminology which might be expected, such as the mention of a ‘solution’ (λύσις and verbal forms), as in the questions-and-answers genre. Only five times does he state that his audience should heed his ‘solution’, such as when he furnishes a ‘solution’ to the meaning of the parable of the sower (Mt 13,43) or when he offers a ‘solution’ to the problem of the curse of Canaan (Gen 9,18).⁸² More frequent for providing clear answers to his questions are various locutions using ‘understanding’ (νοέω, νοῦς, διάνοια) and ‘meaning’ (σημαίνειν), such as ‘the sense is comprehended’ (νοῦς καταλαβεῖν).⁸³ Generally, as in Eusebius of Emesa, Theodoret, and Origen, we may understand these expressions as ‘One must understand this as ...’ (οὕτω δεῖ νοεῖν) or ‘it signifies’,⁸⁴ such as when Chrysostom wants to specify what the verb ‘planted’ (Gen 2,9) means in the case of the garden of Eden.⁸⁵ Here, the ‘it must be understood’ (δεῖ νοεῖν) formula signals his paraphrase answer at the interior of the argument concerning a single word, as in the case of Theodoret.⁸⁶ But for Chrysostom it could also apply to the comprehension of whole verses and sequences, such as when he considers whether we may pass judgement on our brother before considering the evidence (Gen 3,17–4,9). Answer: No. ‘It must be understood’

80 Ibid., 17.9 (PG 53.147).

81 Didymus, *In Gen.* 194,23 (SC 244.124).

82 The two cases of λύσιν are *In Gen. hom.* 28.4 (PG 53.257) and 29.6 (53.269); the three cases of verbal forms are 14.1 (53.111) διέλυσε, on the sower; διαλύσαντες in 17.9 (53.147) and 19.5 (53.164).

83 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 15.2 (PG 53.121).

84 Guinot, ‘Les Questions’, 189; Origen, *Coisl.* 121,1 (CCSG 15.124) on the coats of skin (Gen 3,21) uses ‘noetic’ expression; cf. for development of this use, see A.T. Zanker, *Greek and Latin Expressions of Meaning: The Classical Origins of a Modern Metaphor*, *Zetemata* 151 (München: C.H. Beck, 2016). Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 769 (TEG 2.167) explaining what the word ‘soul’ means in Gen 9,5, ‘it signifies life’ (ψυχὴν νῦν τὴν ζωὴν σημαίνει). Origen, *Cat.* 258 (TEG 1.179), interprets the Hebrew word ‘Chous’ with what the word ‘signifies’ (σημαίνει).

85 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 13.3 (PG 53.108).

86 While τί νοητέον or πῶς νοητέον occur frequently, they usually remain at the level of questions concerning a specific expression or word, e.g. Theodoret, *Q. Gen.* 39,1 (LEC 1.86): ‘what must be understood by these “coats of skin”?’

(δέον ἐννοῆσαι) that God treated Adam similarly, and so too 'he is educating us' (ἡμᾶς παιδεύων).⁸⁷ In this passage, the 'what is this' and 'it must be understood' formulas draw the listener into the teaching he wishes to give to the pericope covering the whole narrative of temptation, fall, and curse in the garden.

Chrysostom's most frequent use of νοεῖν in a questions-and-answers capacity is his declaration of his own opinion. 'Consider, I ask you' or 'It seems to me' (ἐννόησον γάρ μοι, 13×).⁸⁸ After denying that the tree of knowledge of good and evil is planted by a jealous creator, 'It seems to me' that the creator regards human beings with abounding respect, giving him commands directly (Gen 2,16).⁸⁹ In another case, circumcision does not make Abraham righteous (Gen 15,6; Rom 4,3.11), but 'you must consider for me' that he had already obeyed God on several counts.⁹⁰ Similarly, Chrysostom says that the 'spirit' over the waters in Gen 1,2 'seems to me to indicate' (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ τοῦτο σημαίνειν) an energetic life force,⁹¹ and about the outcry of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18,20–21) 'I suppose it to mean' (οἶμαι σημαίνειν) that they were steeped in social injustice.⁹² These expressions often signal dialogue with patristic exegetical traditions. For instance, when he announces that the 'spirit' mentioned in Gen 1,2 'seems to me to indicate' a certain 'energetic life force,' this 'energetic life force' is rooted in an exegetical tradition shared between Basil of Caesarea, Eusebius of Emesa, and Diodore.⁹³

Finally, to announce his answers, Chrysostom also uses forms of ἐρμηνεία and ἐρμηνεύειν (+ 38×). The sense of the term for Chrysostom can consist of more general theoretical reflections on scriptural interpretation. Echoing the famous formulation from the scholia regarding the Homeric poem's self-referential hermeneutics, on weighty matter of man's formation from the breath of God (Gen 2,7), Scripture 'interprets itself' (ἑαυτὴν ἐρμηνευούσης) by providing its own 'overall meaning' (σκοπῶ); 'let us attend to it' (κατακολουθήσωμεν).⁹⁴ In several cases he provides an 'interpretation' in direct response to his question of what

87 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 19.2 (PG 53.161); cf. 22.2 (53.188); 25.4 (53.224).

88 E.g. *ibid.*, 30.2 (PG 53.276; FOC 82.225). It does not always function this way: in one case it announces the importance of giving away wealth (PG 53.276), in another the practice of loving one's enemies (250), in another the ability to gain benefit from the homily's teaching (173).

89 *Ibid.*, 14.3 (PG 53.114).

90 *Ibid.*, 40.4 (PG 53.367).

91 *Ibid.*, 3.1 (PG 53.33).

92 *Ibid.*, 42.3 (PG 53.388).

93 Discussion in Chapter 6.

94 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 13.3 (PG 53.107–108); cf. *ibid.*, 19.3 (PG 53.162), where Scripture gives a clearer (σαφέστερον) interpretation of the curse of the earth.

the text ‘means’ or ‘wants to say’ (τί βούλεται), such as in the spiritual treasure under the particle in front of Adam’s name (Gen 2,20–22).⁹⁵ ‘What does this mean’ (τί ἐστι τό), Chrysostom wonders on another occasion, referring to the promise of the sevenfold judgement to be wrought on Cain’s future killer (Gen 4,15). Chrysostom promises to provide an ‘interpretation according to my ability’ (κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἐμὴν ἐρμηνεύσαι), urging his audience to pause over the answer with him (διαλύσαντες).⁹⁶ The signal of his own answer is here remarkable, as he uses Basil of Caesarea’s *Letter* 260 to furnish a complex solution to what Basil knows as the *zētēma* of Cain’s sins and consequences.⁹⁷ This illustrates the extent to which Chrysostom could go in adopting critical questions of exegesis into his homilies through the language of question-and-answer, or in this case, interpretation, and in many cases undergirded by patristic exegetical traditions.

The cumulative impression, then, is that Chrysostom artfully signals to his audience his own engagement with exegetical questions-and-answers. But he goes one step further and demands that his audience see the connection between the question and the moral application which he wishes to furnish. To get an idea of how these elements interact, in what follows I analyze *Homily 29 on Genesis* in greater detail. It demonstrates how the format of questions-and-answers regarding biblical texts could pervade the structure a homily and cohere into the wider rhetorical purposes of his discourse. I follow the same procedure as the case-study of Chapter 2: I contextualize the biblical narrative, summarize the homily from the basis of the PG 53 text and aspects of Hill’s FOC 82 translation. Then, I show the coherence of his discourse around the modulation of scholarly ‘attention’ rhetoric, questions-and-answers, and the moral application which derives from the detailed consideration of biblical texts. Quotations from PG 53 and FOC 82 pages are cited in parentheses.

5 Case Study: *Homily 29 on Genesis*

Similar to *Homily 37* studied in Chapter 2, *Homily 29* covers a pericope, here Gen 9,21–29, in a selective way but quotes almost all the biblical text within. The texts at hand concern the drama unfolding in Noah’s family immediately following the great flood that renews the earth and mankind. Noah restarts

95 Ibid., 15.1 (53.119).

96 Ibid., 19.5 (PG 53.164).

97 Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 260.3 (COURTONE, III:107–108,28–36). Chapter 6 has full demonstration.

by planting a vineyard. The result is tersely stated: 'He drank some wine and got drunk' (Gen 9,21). What ensues is a dramatic episode involving his sons Japheth, Cham, and Sem. Cham stumbles upon his father in a less than sober state. Instead of covering him up and moving on, the middle son Cham tells his two brothers about it. They hasten to cover up their dad (9,22–23). Noah sobers up, finds out about what Cham did, and curses him (9,24–25). More specifically, he curses Canaan, Cham's son. Noah decrees that Canaan's descendants shall serve those of his uncles, Sem and Japheth (9,26–27). Finally, the narrative closes by marking Noah's years, which totaled 950 (9,28–29).

5.1 *Summary of Homily 29*

All elements of Scripture may benefit the salvation of the human race, even the examples of wickedness (260–261). It works like this in medical practice too: even ailments are used for healing. This is because God desires sinners to repent. Numerous cases from scripture illustrate this (e.g. Ps 42,5–6; Ezk 18,23, Ps 109,4; Ps 38,11–14). Actually, Scripture contains remedies for every kind of problem that we can face (261), such as the social maladies spoken about in expressions like 'all the day' in Ps 38,12. You should take the scriptures even to your houses, so that such teaching never leaves you (262–263).

The benefit from the present passage is considerable. There is a distinction between your getting drunk and that of Noah. He was grieving, and ignorant of the potency of wine. Further, grieving is a state familiar to the prophets (*e.g.*, Jer 8,23; Isa 22,4, Hab 1,3; Amos 7,3) (263–264), for they see the wreckage of mankind. Moses got rather low at one point, suggesting that God might wipe him out as well (Ex 32,32), and Paul expressed the same thing (Rom 9,3). In this way it was familiar to Noah, who in grieving the world's destruction, ended up getting drunk from the vines he planted. Wine is not the source of evil; a deprived attitude is (264).

How can we be certain that Noah was ignorant of the effects of wine? This is worth questioning. We can be confident that Abel would have made use of it had it been available since creation. But like Adam, Noah was an inventive farmer, so he is here operating according to his nature (264). Could not one reply with the question of why wine came into existence at all, seeing that it is responsible for many evils? (265) This is mistaken: again, a deprived attitude is the source of evil, and let us not forget wine's benefits.

In this way, although drunkenness is a despicable sin comparable to the life of beasts and bloody warriors (265), always stemming from satiety (Ps 36,8), the sin of Cham is even more depraved (265–266). Directly contradicting a wise teacher (Sir 3,10), he seeks notoriety from his father's dishonor (266). Broadcasting the sins of others renders everyone involved either shameful or slothful.

The text also says at this point that Cham is the father of Canaan (Gen 9,22). Why would it tell us this detail? To show his incontinence, manifest at a rapid pace. Let us instead behave mercifully like God who desires all men to be saved (1Tim 2,4) or behave like Sem and Japheth who fulfilled the natural law (Ex 20,12; 21,17).

When Noah comes out of his drunkenness, we can be sure that his inebriation was involuntary (267–268), a crucial distinction from voluntary acts, and we can be sure that the youngest of the lot, Cham's son Canaan, receives the curse because Cham has the most juvenile attitude of all (268–269), even though he falls in the middle of Noah's three sons.

This brings us to a much debated question: Why is Canaan cursed when it is his father, Cham, who committed the violation? The solution is twofold: first, God does not contradict his own blessing given to Noah and his sons when departing the ark earlier (Gen 9,1). But God had to chastise Cham in some sense, so he must watch his own son be punished (269). But this brings up again the problem: Why does another man pay the penalty? So, Canaan is punished for the sake of Cham, and not the reverse, which is prohibited in scripture (Ezk 18,20; Dt 24,16); but we can be confident that Canaan is also atoning for his own sin (269). In fact, scripture is so strong on this point about moral autonomy that this episode tells us about the Incarnation, which removed the curse of our predecessors. Death now occurs only at the level of terminology. The punishment brought on by our predecessors does not have to occur in our lives, as Christ demonstrated by raising Lazarus (John 11,11) (270). But like Eve, Canaan's descendants are chastised through subjection and slavery (Gen 3,16; Ezk 16,3) (270–271).

On the other hand, Sem and Japheth were rewarded as instruments of God's goodness (Gen 9,26) and we, like them, should live our lives with this intensity of virtue which reflects onto God's glory. Even the 'curse' of Canaan is really a loving chastisement, a reminder to stop evil from going any further than it already has (271). There is a further treasure here: Sem and Japheth, as figures, suggest the calling of the Jews and the Gentiles, each rewarded correspondingly for their station and behaviour.

It is important to note that Noah lived a long life and refrained from further procreation, a foil to Cham's obvious intemperance in having a son (272). To repeat, this is likely the reason for his curse in the first place. But even while his descendants, Nebrod among them, immediately began to show dominance and pride, this was not always the case. The Ninevites emerge from Cham's ancestry. We all know the beauty of God's mercy in their repentance (272)—this is true freedom (273). We should imitate them, and like Sem and Japheth, thereby remain free from the curse of slavery to sin.

5.2 Questions-and-Answers in Homily 29

A closer examination of *Homily 29* in Table 1 below demonstrates that this homily is structured by questions-and-answers posed to the biblical text. Column one contains the biblical texts on which he comments in successive steps. Column two paraphrases or summarizes the exegetical question, sometimes hidden, in Chrysostom's view brought up by the biblical texts. I focus on formulations used to bring up the question, such as 'Do you see' or 'perhaps someone may say here'. The third column provides the corresponding answers, again with attention both to the form ('He is saying') and to content ('The word for drunkenness is satiety'). Finally, in this column, I indicate where *zētēmata* occur. In columns two and three, phrases are inserted in brackets to aid comprehension of the context. Sentences in full brackets are implied questions or answers and may summarize the 'hidden' question. Column four indicates where the texts may be found in the PG 53 and the page number from Hill's FOC 82 translation.

TABLE 1 Questions and answers in *Homily 29 on Genesis*

Text	Question/problem	Answer/solution	PG; FOC
Ps 109,4	Do you see from what source he looks for assistance?	He is saying [that he looks for assistance] in prayer.	261; 200
Ps 38,11–12	Do you see what he was doing while they were scheming?	The phrase 'all the day' means [that they were scheming against him] all during life.	261; 200
Ps 38,13–14	Do you see how he survived difficult ways?	He is saying that 'difficult ways' means 'Because I depended on my hope in you'.	262; 200
Gen 9,21	Who can deny that this just man was deeply distressed [and so got drunk]?	For proof that [he did not get drunk] out of rashness, that very word 'first' shows ignorance.	263; 202–203
Jer 8,23; Isa 22,4, Hab 1,3; Amos 7,3; et al.	Do you see how each of the just men demonstrated great compassion for his fellows?	Now consider the situation of [Noah, a just man].	264; 204
Gen 9,21–22	It is worth enquiring ("Ἀξίον ἐνταῦθα ζητῆσαι), however, if Noah personally invented the growing of crops.	The usefulness of crop-growing was hardly known [at the time of Noah; he likely did not invent it].	264; 204

TABLE 1 Questions and answers in *Homily 29 on Genesis (cont.)*

Text	Question/problem	Answer/solution	PG; FOC
Gen 9,22	Perhaps, on the other hand, someone might say, Why was vinedressing, source of such terrible wickedness, introduced into life?	Sins arise not from wine but from one's depraved attitude.	265; 205
Gen 9,22	[What is drunkenness?]	The word for drunkenness, dearly beloved, is also [that] for satiety.	265; 206
Gen 9,22	See this happened to him, not somewhere out in the open, [but, where exactly did it happen?]	The reason [that he was] 'in his dwelling' [shows Cham's] wickedness.	266; 207
Gen 9,22	Why, tell me, does he mention [Canaan's] name at this point, too?	For you to learn [Cham] was intemperate and incontinent.	266; 207
Gen 9,22	[Why was Cham different than his brothers?]	Notice, they had the same nature yet did not betray the same inclinations.	266; 207
Gen 9,23–Sir 3,10	Yet his brothers did not 'seek notoriety' from the dishonor of their father; instead, what?	Do you see these sons' right attitude, not violating the words of the sage?	266; 208
Ex 20,12	[How did they know to honor their father when the law was not yet promulgated?]	Do you see how nature had in anticipation arrived at adequate instruction?	267; 209
Gen 9,24	What is meant by 'he came out of it'?	[It means] 'possessed' or 'in a fit'.	267; 210
Gen 9,24	What is meant by 'what he had done'?	It refers to something rave and intolerable.	268; 211
Gen 9,24	[Scripture says that Cham was the] 'youngest' son [in one place], but [in another place says that] he was the second oldest.	[It says this because he was the] more juvenile in attitude.	268; 212
Gen 9,25	The question bandied about everywhere [τὸ ζήτημα τὸ πανταχοῦ περιφερόμενον]: Why is it that, though the father [of Canaan, Cham] was at fault in publicizing	Heed the solution of the problem [δέχεσθε τὴν τοῦτου λύσιν]: it was the sin of disrespect.	269; 212

TABLE 1 Questions and answers in *Homily 29 on Genesis (cont.)*

Text	Question/problem	Answer/solution	PG; FOC
	his parent's nakedness, it is the son [Canaan] who bears the curse?		
Gen 9,25–9,1	To be sure, someone will say, while this shows that the reason he did not curse Cham was that he had enjoyed blessing from God, nevertheless why is it that, though he was the sinner, the other man had to pay the penalty?	[Cham, the father,] also felt its effects, as seeing one's children bearing punishment proves a more grievous form of punishment. [Further, the punishment happened so as] not to undermine the blessing already bestowed by God.	269; 213
Gen 9,25, Ezk 18,20, Dt 24,16	[Does scripture generally condone the practice of children being punished for their parents' misdeeds, and vice versa?]	Several texts from the bible tell explicitly against this practice.	269; 213
Gen 9,25, Ezk 16,3, Dan 13,56	[How do we know Canaan was deprived?]	[In fact, elsewhere in the bible there is] proof that the son's life was inherently deprived [as was that of] all his successors.	271; 215
Gen 9,26	[The blessing announced here], someone may perhaps say, is not a blessing [conferred on] Sem [the first born].	[That may be; accordingly, it is Sem who blessed God, and God responded by making] Sem beneficiary of greater blessing.	271; 216
Gen 9,27	[What is the deeper significance of the blessing of Sem and Japheth?]	There is treasure below the surface [here]. I am inclined to think he is suggesting the calling of the two peoples—through Sem the Jews [and through Japheth the gentiles].	271; 217
Gen 9,28–29	[Why did Noah refrain from procreation?]	Do not think that this was to no purpose: [it was to demonstrate] Cham's extreme intemperance [in procreating].	272; 217–218
Gen 10,6	Some people say the phrase, 'in the Lord's sight', means opposition to God.	I on the contrary [think] rather [that] the person [Nimrod] was strong and brave.	272; 218

TABLE 1 Questions and answers in *Homily 29 on Genesis* (cont.)

Text	Question/problem	Answer/solution	PG; FOC
Gen 10,6	But the phrase 'in the presence of the Lord God' [what does it mean?]	It means 'created by him'.	272; 218

5.3 *Zetetic Rhetoric and Scholarly Traditions*

In her analysis of *Homily 23 on Genesis*, Amirav showed that Chrysostom's view of Noah fits the general Stoic influence on diatribe-homiletics in Late Antiquity, with its emphasis on defining virtue in relation to free will.⁹⁸ The point he makes in *Homily 23* is striking: as the single man Noah retained the true character of a human being by avoiding carnal impulses, the mass crowd of his contemporaries chose the path of social acceptance steeped in moral deterioration, thereby deserving the lot of destruction which falls upon them in the form of the flood. The central exegetical problems Chrysostom raises in *Homily 29 on Genesis* could not better fit this same message; indeed, twice in the *prooemium* Chrysostom mentions the 'plan' (ὑπόθεσις) of the Noah cycle and his teaching on it (260). Noah did not willfully become drunk, and Canaan was not cursed without reason. Chrysostom constructs these points in his discourse through overlapping various text-worlds which are accessed through a loose line-by-line exegetical structure, often following the posing of questions-and-answers.

The first line-by-line treatment occurs around quotations and paraphrase explanations of Ps 38,11–14, alternating between lemma and explanation. This leads to a full exposition of Gen 9,21–29 with attention to 10,4–6. Throughout, his approach to the text is through questions. Especially with the Psalm texts, the answers to his questions take the form of paraphrases. When the psalmist explains his situation as suffering 'the whole day' (Ps 38,12), Chrysostom pauses over this term with a question in order to paraphrase it. 'Do you see them concocting schemes ...' he says, invoking scenes of slander and social back-biting (260–261; FOC 82.200). When in the next verse the Psalmist has become a 'deaf person', Chrysostom relates this to his audience by asking how it aligns with the 'difficult ways' mentioned in the next line, using the same expression 'do

98 Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 159–187. An excellent resource exploring this influence further is Maxwell, *Christianization*, 11–64.

you see' (εἶδες) and others like 'what, tell me' (τί γὰρ, εἰπέ μοι) to connect them (261). This is not about establishing a democratic dialogue with his audience where their own viewpoint is solicited and considered. For Chrysostom, these questions signal to his audience how the specific words of the text relate back to the 'plan' of the larger passage, which is to capitalize on the universal message of Scripture. 'Our benefit' (ὠφέλειαν τὴν ἡμετέραν) found in Scripture is the salvation of the human race (γένος) (261). Proof-texts from Ezekiel support this impression: 'God desires the salvation of all men' (18,20) which is the repentance of sinners. 'Do you see how', he says, each 'depression' (ἀθυμίαν) plaguing human nature receives in Scripture its own medicine (φάρμακον) (262). We know from elsewhere in Chrysostom's *œuvre* that depression is correlated to free will. In his long letter to Stageirios, depression is a result of the monk's concern for 'repute' (δόξα), coincidentally also the charge Chrysostom laid before Greek philosophy,⁹⁹ so despising such false beliefs can ward off depression as a demon.¹⁰⁰ Noah, then, may be viewed as participating in that holiness-process by which depression is a 'trial' (πειρασμός) for him to despise repute.¹⁰¹ Chrysostom's characterization of humanity's ills as 'depression' early in *Homily 29 on Genesis* is a brilliant rhetorical move, as it anticipates the content of the Genesis texts on which he will comment. To transition to the Genesis texts, he piles on metaphor after metaphor regarding the Genesis-text reading and his teaching for 'today': spiritual gain, food at the table, treasure concealed beneath the surface, benefit of the dogmas; verbal exhortations also contribute: let us consider, let us dig, let us feast (262–263).

The questions posed to the Genesis text give way to more elaborate expositions based on critical exegetical problems but apply no less to this vision of salvation to all in accordance with the dynamics of human free will. The first difficulty is 'worth inquiring'. It questions the fact that Noah, our moral exemplar, got drunk: 'Who can deny that this just man was deeply distressed [and so got drunk]'? Then follows another question signaling the answer: 'Do we notice when' (ὅταν ἀκούσωμεν) Noah gets drunk, this is 'not like' (οὐχ ὅμοιον) when we do? (263) The immediate defamiliarization through a question sets Chrysostom up to give the 'reason' (ἀπολογίαν) of Noah's actions: 'great ignorance' (ἄγνοιαν) and plagued by depression (ἀθυμίᾳ). Biblical proof texts show

99 J. Tloka, *Griechische Christen—christliche Griechen. Plausibilierungsstrategien des antiken Christentums bei Origenes und Johannes Chrysostomos*, STAC 30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 125–244.

100 J. Wright, 'Between Despondency and the Demon: Diagnosing and Treating Spiritual Disorders in John Chrysostom's *Letter to Stageirios*', *JLA* 8.2 (2015), 351–367.

101 John Chrysostom, *Ad Stag.* 9 (PG 47.446).

that it is the 'habit' (ἔθος) of prophets to do this, to consider their woes amidst righteousness as belonging to the whole human condition—recalling universal 'depression' mentioned earlier. The underlying question here is apologetic: does the bible condone drunkenness, if the righteous man of his generation is found in this condition after exiting the ark? The first witness to this question in patristic exegetical tradition is Origen's *Scholia on Genesis*, and it is found subsequently in Basil and Eusebius of Emesa.¹⁰² Like Chrysostom, Origen and Basil answer that Noah was, respectively, 'not aware' and 'ignorant', using terminology similar to that of Chrysostom. Thus, when Chrysostom says that this is 'worth inquiring', he is invoking by questions-and-answers format a considerably developed patristic exegetical tradition which does not belong to one group of authors in particular, such as Antiochene versus Alexandrian, and it is notable that this tradition was developed by works related to the questions-and-answers genre, such as the *Commentary on Genesis* of Eusebius of Emesa. Chrysostom deploys this tradition to create a contrast between his audience and Noah.

The aesthetic experience of tradition here is complex. On the one hand, in Chrysostom the question and part of its answer is re-application rather than revision: the apologetic tone is found also in the previous models. Chrysostom's answer, though, strongly creates the prophetic profile of Noah, as 'depression' is found as a key trial through which prophets suffer for the sake of the good of the rest of humanity (plagued by many depressions, as said earlier), a one-versus-the-many social construction that recalls the function of depression as an exhortation to cast off 'repute'. These elements are unique to Chrysostom, suggesting a revision element in the tradition. Depression is a reasonable explanation given the circumstances, and Chrysostom brilliantly relates Noah's perception of his shattered world with the profile of the tragic prophet. Chrysostom prepares his audience to take this mantle of Noah's singularity upon themselves, viewing their own virtuous standing in relation to those outside the Church and those not suffering for the sake of virtue.

In further cases of questions-and-answers regarding biblical texts in *Homily* 29, we see literary critical questions at stake: moral appropriateness, narrative coherence, and the possibility of contradiction within the Scriptures. He goes on quickly from the initial problem of drunkenness and questions the very practicality of the wine, also addressed in the tradition witnessed by Origen, Eusebius of Emesa, and Basil. Like Chrysostom, they affirm that Noah was the inventor of wine, a strong point for his moral blamelessness. Chrysos-

102 See Chapter 8 for details.

tom brings up this question by saying 'it is worth inquiring' (ἀλλ' ἄξιον ζητῆσαι, 264), and after establishing that because the biblical text mentions the word 'first', Noah was indeed the inventor, Chrysostom goes further and permits a comparison with Adam, who acting out of knowledge in his nature, farmed the soil. 'But someone might equally say' (ἀλλ' ἴσως εἴποι τις ἄν), says a hidden question, that introducing wine was a wicked endeavor, and that Noah's was a 'plant of vices' instead of a plant of virtue (265). But Chrysostom ensures us that depraved 'mindset' (γνώμη) is the real culprit behind evils, not wine. A potential exegetical-apologetic difficulty is thereby manipulated to harken back to the track of his moral *paraenesis*, which is modulated through three exegetical problems from the short text sequence of Gen 9,20–21.

To prove further that evil is rooted in deprived human mindsets and not attributable to the divine, the pericope of Cham's indecency is grist for the mill. Like the drunkenness section, several points emerge. He draws his audience's attention to the new section with 'do you see' and 'why, tell me' (266). First, Chrysostom must deal with Cham's striking moral blunder in seeing his father's nakedness and publicizing the fact to his brothers, for Chrysostom a libelous action if there ever was one. Chrysostom also wonders 'why, tell me' Gen 9,22 includes the mention that Cham is Canaan's father. Answer: to anticipate the curse to come by showing his incontinence in having a child right away. But more to the point of his embarrassing his father, Cham's behaviour contrasts with that of his brother in important ways. For the latter acted out of their innate sense of right and wrong, whereas Cham ignored this mindset (266–267), an impression which Chrysostom substantiates with references to the Decalogue and commandments (Ex 18–21) regarding the honor of father and mother.

More questions appear regarding details in the text, and they resolve potential contradictions in the text. For instance, Cham's juvenile attitude is at one point said to derive from him being the 'youngest' son (9,25), despite his earlier being enumerated as the middle child (Gen 9,18)—a scrupulous detail Chrysostom merges into the flow of his discourse with modulations to his audience: 'do you see' how such details are given 'not simply' (οὐδὲν ἀπλῶς) nor 'given as chance' (ἔτυχεν) in the scriptures? (269) But no question captures Chrysostom's attention quite like that deriving from Gen 9,25, in which Canaan receives his curse: 'Why is it that, though the father was at fault in publicizing his parent's nakedness, it is the son who bears the curse?' (PG 53.269; FOC 82.212) This question is 'mooted about on all sides' (ζήτημα τὸ πανταχοῦ περιφερόμενον), recalling the formulas for introducing such common problems in Homeric and Christian commentary.

It was common, indeed. The problem of Cham's curse was raised initially by Origen's *Scholia on Genesis*, and in his own commentary, Eusebius of Emesa raises it as a 'question' (ἰσχυρῶς).¹⁰³ When answering whether children may be punished for their parents' sins, for Chrysostom, Jer 38,30, Ezk 18,20 and Dt 24,16 reassure us that this is not the case. The texts are cited to similar effect in Tertullian, Origen, Acacius, Basil, and Ambrosiaster,¹⁰⁴ the works of Acacius and Ambrosiaster being composed in questions-and-answers genre. But not all of these works address the problem in the context of Cham's curse: Chrysostom is adapting an exegetical tradition. The significance of the question may be seen from the viewpoint of Origen. In his refutation of Celsus, Origen addressed what was for Celsus the Homeric doctrine that punishment extends to 'children's children'.¹⁰⁵ In Origen's view the bible offers a much 'better' (βέλτιον) doctrine of punishment, namely that each person is responsible for their own soul. At stake in this citation chain, then, was a point at which Christians believed they could draw a fundamental distinction between their conception of the moral life versus those of other philosophical traditions. From this perspective, Chrysostom's *zētēma* arose from a context of learned argumentation. It illustrates an important point brought up in Chapter 1 of this volume by Viciano, Perrone, and Zamagni, namely the relationship between patristic exegetical questions-and-answers formats and genres and pagan critiques. Here, it seems that a critique of Celsus inspired an entire tradition to take root and develop as a resource for Chrysostom to use. It seamlessly fits his wider rhetorical purposes, as the proof-texts clearly defend the idea that Cham and Canaan are responsible for the malady spoken upon them with divine consent.

Chrysostom's answer also concerns matters of contradiction. First, he wishes to point out that this curse on Cham does not undermine the general blessing on Noah's sons spoken earlier (Gen 9,1), ensuring narrative coherence and avoiding the problem of divine providence altering its course. With a question he pivots to his next point: 'To be sure, someone will say, while ...,' carrying on the dialogical character of his preaching (269). But this question really just provides him an opportunity to modulate his answer, moving to the proof-text section regarding the sins of parents not transferring to their sons.

103 Origen, *Coisl.* 160 (CCSG 15.156–157); Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 51b (TEG 15.102). See Chapter 8 for discussion of Origen's *scholia* works.

104 Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 2.15.2 (CCSL 1.492), Origen, *C. Cels.* 8.40 (SVC 54.554); Acacius, *Frag. Ex.* 20,5–6 (ST 201.119–120); Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 223.4 (COURTONE, 111:15); Ambrosiaster, *QVNT* 14.3 (CSEL 50.40); Severus of Antioch, *Frag. Deut.* 50 (TEG 14.44). See Chapter 9 for discussion of this under the analysis of *testimonia* collections.

105 Origen, *C. Cels.* 8.40 (SVC 54.554,12).

To juxtapose these unfortunate patriarchs further, three typologies emerge, as Cham's curse is the 'origin of his subsequent condition of servitude' (PG 53.270; FOC 82.214). The first typology is that of sin: Paul suggests that servitude, like death, is really 'only a name' (ὄνομα μόνον) that does not exert any real power over us—servitude does not define our moral condition unless we allow it. Similarly, Eve was subjugated as a servant to Adam (Gen 3,16), Chrysostom goes on, but this did not stop her from exercising self-control, and now racial groups should do this (270–271). Second, there is the typology of Jews and Gentiles that stem from Sem and Japheth, which Chrysostom wishes for his audience to discover as a 'treasure below the surface' (271), just to show that from this situation comes a pattern for our imitation and another falls away. 'Let us hasten' (σπουδάζωμεν) towards the former. This typology is found in Origen, Justin, and Irenaeus.¹⁰⁶ Another exegetical tradition emerges as he closes the homily. 'Some people say' that the phrase of Gen 10,6–9 regarding Cham's descendent Nebrod is indication that he is opposed to God. Remarkably, though, Chrysostom expresses 'I, on the contrary do not think this' (ἐγὼ δὲ οὐχ ἡγοῦμαι τοῦτο) (PG 53.272; FOC 82.218). In the form that we have the homilies, Chrysostom thereby sets himself against previous exegetical traditions which affirm the literal value of the text—the name-gloss 'against' is stated in the Genesis text!¹⁰⁷ But in the light of the 'plan' of Noah, namely the significance of free will, it is not surprising to see Chrysostom revise models of textual interpretation to suit his purposes. In fact, it is not entirely against the 'history' of the text, as Chrysostom shows that Cham's future descendants, the Ninevites, found repentance at last.

Closing this long discourse, Chrysostom defines 'true freedom' (ἀληθὴ ἐλευθερίαν): in contrast to the slavery of the curse which Canaan received, 'let us free ourselves [ἐλευθερωθῶμεν] and let us not become [μὴ γενώμεθα] slaves to sin', picking up one of the typologies he develops earlier. Similar to his *Homily 37 on Genesis* where he defined 'true riches', Chrysostom captures the thread of the discourse by defining the 'true' element of some desirable quality. Exegetical traditions have helped him defamiliarize what we might normally think of as a guaranteed path to moral success and human recognition, namely family background and status. But in true Stoic fashion, Chrysostom retorts: ultimately, it neither helps nor harms.

106 Details in Chapter 8.

107 Nebrod's name is interpreted as 'opposed to God' by Philo, *De gig.* 65,5 and Ps.-Clement, *Hom.* 9.4.1.

6 Conclusion

In the *Homilies on Genesis*, questioning the biblical text was a pervasive practice, and it often connected with developed patristic exegetical traditions. Many of these *zētēmata* concerned apologetic-exegetical difficulties and affirm the complex knot tying together patristic questions-and-answers, pagan criticism, and biblical commentary. The variety of metaphorical constructions that Chrysostom used, and their parallels to other authors, show how he emulated the formal expectations of how to talk about a text in Late Antiquity. But he also drew on the knowledge of these problems, emphasizing the texts in the bible that supported a rigid singular moral autonomy program and eschewing any notion of fateful generational sin which some had attributed to Homer. True, at points, Chrysostom demurs from discussing answers to his questions, or he misses more complex exegetical difficulties at stake, or the answer that he provides is not really a dialogue encouraging open speculation. For this, some portraits of his learned anti-intellectualism are justified. However, next to these cases must be admitted those in which he clearly connects a learned exegetical difficulty to the moral application of his discourse. Questions-and-answers in Chrysostom's hands raised issues well-known in Christian exegetical tradition, and he expected his audience to gain an awareness of basic tools for responding and comprehending these, such as the *testimonium* which proves the argument about moral autonomy. Via the posing of questions and their answers, we also see emerging a sense of Chrysostom's self-understanding as an exegete, his ability to insert his own opinion in distinction to others. Revising previous ideas, he operated with a degree of freedom in relation to his models.

Grammar and Linguistic Analysis in Rhetorical Context

John Chrysostom was convinced that the words of the Greek bible needed to be explored from multiple angles. In a telling passage from an instruction likely given in Antioch, he considers the meaning of the word ‘baptism’. Only a single word, he acknowledges, yet it is manifold (παντοδαπά) in its meaning.¹ Based on biblical texts, he elaborates six different names for baptism: purification (Tit 3,5), illumination (Heb 10,32), vestment (Gal 3,27), burial (Rom 6,4), circumcision (Col 2,11), and cross (Rom 6,6). He could go on all day, he says, with other names, but the first name listed will occupy him at present. In another context, Chrysostom seems to have reflected on the semantic possibilities of the word ‘faith’. As one tradition of his writing attests, between Old and New Testaments, faith is a ‘polysemous’ (πολύσημος) term, ‘here’ (ἐκεῖνο) signifying the waiting for a promise, ‘there’ (ἐνταῦθα) the reception of its reward.² Similar reflections occur elsewhere in his work, regarding the Pauline terms ‘life’ and ‘death’,³ as well as the sense of the polysemous *parabolē* mentioned across the Greek Bible.⁴ Ever with his eyes on the benefit for his audience’s progress towards salvation, Chrysostom plied and manipulated the language of the Greek bible for demonstrating that the perceptible universe had spiritual correspondents, what Young and Brottier have identified as the practice of substituting different verbal expressions for the same point of reference.⁵ There is the bodily ‘death’ that comes from sin’s curse on the one hand, and there is the ‘death’ that comes from participation in Christ on the other. The latter, of course, is actually ‘life’, recalling what we have seen in *Homily 37 and 29 on Genesis*, namely the defining of what is ‘truly’ riches or freedom. Many studies of Chrysostom have shown that his hanging entire discourse-meanings on single words and their refer-

1 John Chrysostom, *Illum. Cat.* 1.8.5 (SC 366.126); for provenance, Piédagnel, *Trois catéchèses*, SC 366.38–39.

2 John Chrysostom, *In Heb. hom.* 26 (EP 7.290c). The readings here quoted are found in *Marci-
anus Append. II.* 178 and *Monacensis Graecus* 377. Savile relied on the latter. Field did not
retain πολύσημος in his text but included it in the apparatus.

3 John Chrysostom, *In Phil. hom.* 4 (EP 5.33b–c).

4 John Chrysostom, *Exp. in Ps. XLVIII* 2 (PG 55.225).

5 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 119; L. Brottier, ‘Sur quelques définitions de πνευματικός chez Jean
Chrysostome’, *REAug* 38 (1992), 19–28.

ents belongs more to his theory of divine accommodation to the weakness of human understanding than an application to various 'senses' of scripture.⁶ This has helped us move beyond anachronistic characterizations of his hermeneutics.

Yet it remains difficult to classify how, exactly, he viewed biblical language beyond the grand-theory of accommodation. There is confusion regarding the role of linguistic explanation in the preaching of John Chrysostom. Cook recently judged Chrysostom's engagement with the branch of 'methodological' exegesis concerned with linguistic issues as 'irrelevant to his task as preacher'.⁷ While this is to overlook Chrysostom's use of the *recentiores* in the works on the Psalms and Isaiah, a vexing problem to be sure,⁸ Cook's wider point in this statement is, I think, to stress that Chrysostom was not a textual critic and grammarian concerned with matters like pronunciation and rhythmical cadence. Yet the generalization about linguistic considerations risks occluding a significant practice across Chrysostom's *œuvre*. Young and Hidal, on the other hand, recognize the role of glossing words in Antiochene exegesis, the latter concluding that Chrysostom 'never satisfies himself with simply paraphrasing the text ... but always searches for the *skopos*'.⁹ Hidal's statement provides important nuance to the issue, recalling the theme that exegesis never for Chrysostom exists as an end in itself, but is always appropriated into either a sub-*skopos* or the grand-*skopos* of the discourse. We may profitably situate Chrysostom's practice of word-explanations, then, by showing *how* these

6 Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy*, 122; Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 263; Chase, *Chrysostom*, 45; Fabbi, 'La «condiscendenza»', 338; Th. Förster, *Chrysostomus in seinem Verhältnis zur Antiochenischen Schule. Ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte* (Gotha: Perthes, 1869), 36, for whom Chrysostom's priority is merely 'Redefiguren,' which 'setzt er auf Rechnung der göttlichen Herablassung zu dem schwachen Verständniss des Menschen'.

7 Cook, *Preaching*, 62.

8 These works contain considerable use of the *recentiores*, but as already noted in Chapter 2, n. 90, the *Expositiones in Psalmos* available in the PG 55 is highly problematic; to wield it properly requires at least specialization in Psalter-catenae traditions. The Isaiah commentary is difficult for different reasons, as it survives in full only in Armenian and the question of authorship needs a full study. See Dumortier, *Commentaire*, SC 304.12–14 and N. Smelova, 'St John Chrysostom's Exegesis on the Prophet Isaiah: The Oriental Translations and their Manuscripts', *StPatr* 67 (2013), 295–309, for discussion. If this commentary is genuine Chrysostom, or any fourth- to fifth-century Greek author for that matter, it calls for a ter Haar Romeny-style investigation of the use of the *recentiores* in relation to Eusebius of Emesa's methodology.

9 S. Hidal, 'Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Antiochene School with its Prevalent Literal and Historical Method', in M. Sæbø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament*, 559; Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 171–172 and esp. 249–251 on Chrysostom's use of 'deductive paraphrase' in the *Homilies on 1 Corinthians*, cf. Molinié, *Chrysostome*, 296–302.

appropriations occur: with what lexical traditions and in dialogue with what patristic exegetical traditions. As part of an 'exegetical culture', Chrysostom regularly identified grammatical, rhetorical, and philological points throughout his discourses. To advance the impression of a learned pedigree, some of these cases notably invoke developed exegetical traditions which he marshals for his aims in a particular discourse. In the present chapter, I assess Chrysostom's linguistic concerns as glossing, identifying 'habits', and onomastic interpretation. The concluding case-study is aimed at showing how comments on these topics fit the search for the *skopos*.

1 Glossing

Glossing is the provision of short comments by means of synonyms or paraphrastic expressions. The practice is easily identifiable, as it is often signaled by standard linguistic markers that parallel those used in commentary and scholia, such as 'what is this' (τί ἐστὶ) or 'instead of' (ἀντὶ τοῦ). Such expressions occur in the *Homilies on Genesis* available to us over 200 times. Their pervasiveness demonstrates a consistent concern to explain the words of the bible, sometimes to illustrate and support a spiritual framework with resonances elsewhere in the given homily, but other times simply to provide comprehension for his audience. Based on a selection of 18 representative cases from this considerable harvest, I specify some of Chrysostom's priorities in selecting words to gloss, and I show that some of these related to ancient lexical traditions, suggesting a scholarly program behind their deployment in Chrysostom *Homilies on Genesis*. First, however, it is important to contextualize glossing as a grammatical and exegetical practice within Late Antique textual commentary.

1.1 *Glossing in Ancient Textual Commentary*

Glossing was an ancient practice stemming from Alexandrian Homeric scholarship that addressed apparently unfamiliar uses of a common word.¹⁰ Glossing was included in the early systematizations of grammar initiated by the *Ars*

10 The papyrological evidence presented in A. Henrichs, 'Scholia minora zu Homer I–IV', *ZPE* 7 (1971), 101–107 supports this characterization, usefully contextualized with the Aristarchan evidence in S. Matthaios, *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs. Texte und Interpretation zur Wortartenlehre*, Hypomnemata 126 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999). A survey of ancient gloss-works stemming from Homeric scholarship A.R. Dyck, 'The Glossographoi', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 91 (1987), 119–160. For later developments, see the survey in Gräfenhan, *Geschichte*, 111:164–189 and more recently N. Wilson, 'On the Transmission of the Greek Lexica', *GRBS* 23.4 (1982), 369–375.

grammatica of Dionysius Thrax, upon which later scholia and commentators added, providing us with a cake, as it were, of complex layers suggesting different ideal conceptualizations of grammatical and exegetical disciplines.¹¹ In the imperial and late antique periods, some located the provision of glossing words (ἀπόδοσις γλωσσῶν) within exegesis proper, so it was conceived as a vital part of explaining poetic expressions.¹² For others, glossing was placed next to exegesis as a separate or auxiliary instrument of grammar alongside other ‘organs’ such as etymology and textual criticism.¹³ More generally, we know from the second-century rhetor Aelius Theon that *paraphrasis* was placed among Second Sophistic *progymnasmata*.¹⁴

The Homeric glossary of Apion (SGLG 3), likely composed around the first-century C.E., is a late example of Hellenistic lexical scholarship.

- 11 As Schaublin, *Untersuchungen*, 35, recognized, these divisions are often illogical and do not give us any ‘echte Vorstellung von der Tätigkeit des antiken Interpreten im Unterricht’. A useful guide to the reconstruction of such divisions is S. Matthaios, ‘Greek Scholarship in the Imperial Era and Late Antiquity’, in Montanari et al. (eds.), *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Scholarship*, 193–202. To illustrate the variability, Quintilian belonged to a trend in Latin grammarians that reduced earlier Greek six and four-fold divisions of grammar into the dichotomy of methodical and historical parts mentioned above. For other examples in the imperial period, see M. Glück, *Priscians Partitiones und ihre Stellung in der spätantiken Schule*, Spudasmata 12 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1967) and F. Desbordes, ‘Homonymie et synonymie d’après les textes théoriques latins’ in G. Clerico et al. (eds.), *Idées grecques et romaines sur le langage. Travaux d’histoire et d’épistémologie* (Lyon: ENS Éditions, 2007), 307–357.
- 12 According to H. Usener, ‘Ein altes Lehrgebäude der Philologie’, in *Kleine Schriften, Bd. 2: Arbeiten zur Lateinischen Sprache und Literatur* (Leipzig–Berlin: Teubner, 1913), 265–314, in the generation following Dionysius, Tyrannion located glossing within the division of explanation (ἐξήγησις) of poetic expressions. A series of four sub-techniques (ἔργον) defined this category: clarification of a word’s meaning (γλωσσηματικόν), rhetorical analysis, metrical evaluation and stylistic criticism, and analysis of historical realities (ιστορικόν). This division is attested in the discussion attributed to Stephanus in *Schol. ad Dion. Thrac.*, GG 1/3.164,9–22; see 169,11–18 where the principle of glossing is illustrated by a comparison of the possible semantic ranges of the word ‘wrath’.
- 13 Dionysius Thrax, *Ars gramm.* 1 (GG 1/1.5,3–6,3) states the six ‘parts’ (μέρη) of grammar: ‘reading (ἀνάγνωσις) aloud masterfully; explanation (ἐξήγησις) of poetic expressions in the text; interpretation of glosses and histories (γλωσσῶν τε καὶ ιστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις); discovery of etymology (ἐτυμολογίας εὑρεσις); accounting of analogy (ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός); and critical evaluations of literary works (κρίσις ποιημάτων).’ I rely on L. Pagani, ‘Pioneers of Grammar: Hellenistic Scholarship and the Study of Language’, in F. Montanari–L. Pagani (eds.), *From Scholars to Scholia: Chapters in the History of Ancient Greek Scholarship*, TCSV 9. Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2011, 17–64, esp. 20 for the translation of these terms.
- 14 Aelius Theon, *Progymn.* 15 (PATILLON, 107).

The definitions of what, exactly, was glossing, also vary. For the scholar Tauriscus, active in the generation following Dionysius and belonging to the so-called rival school of Pergamon, 'the study of λέξεις probably means their categorization into foreign [ξέναι] old, and common or usual'.¹⁵ This definition draws out the comparative technique involved in glossing and gestures towards the wider philosophical debates in which grammatical practices were implicated.¹⁶ For instance, the grammarians and sophists alike held to the principle of 'true synonymy', by which they sought the 'one-to-one correspondence of word and meaning'.¹⁷ Terms such as 'the use of an improper word' (ἀκυρολογία), 'homonymy' (ὁμώνυμος) and 'coincidence' (συνέμπτωσις) emerged to address ambiguities caused between a word's form and its meaning, and grammarians such as the second-century grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus called attention to the role of rhetorical context in the adoption of these techniques.¹⁸

Analogy was thereby the governing technique for glossing, a comparison to elucidate either strange uses of familiar words, cast unfamiliar terms into more comprehensible expressions, or, more curiously, 'paraphrase words that no ancient reader is likely to have found difficult'.¹⁹ The scholia attest to both philological and didactic applications, and usefully illustrates what glossing

15 Ps-Plutarch, *Vit. Hom.* 2.14.171–179 (BT 14–15) classifies words in relation to the 'Greek sounds' as ξέναι, ἀρχαῖαι, κοινὰ and συνήθεις; discussion of the utility of this text for defining classifications of ancient 'diction' is in H.J. Mette, *Parateresis. Untersuchungen zur Sprachtheorie des Krates von Pergamon* (Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1952), 57. As M. Seppänen, *Defining the Art of Grammar: Ancient Perceptions of γραμματική and grammatica*, *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis*, b 379 (Turku: University of Turku, 2014), 44 points out, Quintilian (*Inst.* 1.5.3) also identifies divisions into 'ours or foreign', 'simple or compound', 'literal or metaphorical' and 'in current use or made up'. Later grammarians such as the second-century C.E. Sextus Empiricus, *Adv. Math.* 1.248–251 (SEO 3.61–62; BLANK, 49–50) echoed this conception of glossing as the study of diction (λέξεις), and he appropriated earlier ideas of placing it within a so-called rational (λογικόν) component of literary criticism.

16 Pagani, 'Pioneers', 22; cf. Seppänen, *Defining the Art of Grammar*, 56.

17 I. Sluiter, *Ancient Grammar in Context. Contributions to the Study of Ancient Linguistic Thought* (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1990), 7. Dionysius Thrax, *Ars gramm.* 8.7 (GG 1/1.36.5–6) understood synonyms as 'different names refer to the same thing' (τὸ ἐν διαφόροις ὀνόμασι τὸ αὐτὸ δηλοῦν), such as 'sword' may be represented by ξίφος, μάχαιρα, and others.

18 Sluiter, *Ancient Grammar*, 125–127.

19 Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic*, 15. The principle of analogy in grammatical study is discussed in W. Ax, 'Sprache als Gegenstand der alexandrinischen und pergamenischen Philologie', in K. Döring–Th. Ebert (eds.), *Dialektiker und Stoiker. Zur Logik der Stoa und ihrer Vorläufer* (Stuttgart: Fr. Steiner, 1993), 11–32 and D.L. Blank, 'Analogy, Anomaly and Apollonius Dyscolus', in S. Everson (ed.), *Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 149–165.

looked like in practice. The so-called ‘exegetical’ bT scholia on the Iliad, for instance, explains a peculiar expression regarding the entreating of Achilles: “‘Falling into the ships” should be understood as begging [ἀντὶ τοῦ δεηθῆναι] Achilles, as when we say “one falls in your hands”’.²⁰ Here, the bT scholiast knows that Aristarchus athetized this line, ‘falling into the ships’, and so argues that it should be retained based on an appreciation of the expression ‘to fall’ in common speech and what the scholiast views as a consistent application of this word throughout the poem.²¹ This text addresses an apparently unfamiliar use of a common word. Another example from the D scholia testifies to a more didactic approach to specialized or difficult terms, such as in clarifying the poetic ὄφρα, ‘instead of [ἀντὶ τοῦ] “until which”’.²²

The application of such linguistic concerns signaled by expressions like ‘instead of’ (ἀντὶ τοῦ), into Antiochene biblical (especially Old Testament) commentary, has been established.²³ For example, Theodore, Chrysostom’s contemporary, could explain that the psalmist used the biblical term ‘he set camp’ [Ps 33,8] to mean (ἀντὶ τοῦ) ‘to be an ally.’²⁴ Did Theodore provide this comment because his audience did not know the meaning of the word ‘he set up camp’? It is unlikely. The glossing of this term, Schaublin shows, likely derives from a Septuagint glossary, for it has been shown that exegetes like Origen and Theodore used attic and Septuagint lexical aids to identify a scriptural ‘feature’ (συνήθεια) or ‘habit’ (ἔθος).²⁵ In this case about ‘he set camp’, Theodore uses a lexical tradition to clarify the term for the specific sense he wanted to give it.²⁶ For the one relying on God’s help, angels encamp around him and guard him from evil,

20 Schol. bT in *Il. Ad* 15.56, b, l.33–34 (SGHI 4.22).

21 M. Schmidt, ‘Portrait of an Unknown Scholiast’, in Matthaios et al. (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar*, 153–155, esp. 154 for the translation of the scholia text in this paragraph.

22 Schol. d in *Il. Ad* 2.769 (VAN THIEL, 141).

23 Mariès, *Études*, 123–127; Schaublin, *Untersuchungen*, 95–123; ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 89–113; Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 172.

24 Theodore, *Comm. Ps.* 33,8 (ST 93.161,6; WGRW 5.323).

25 For Origen, see Neuschäfer, *Origenes*, 1:142–155 and compare Cadiou, ‘Dictionnaires antiques’ and the recently edited text of Origen, *Def.* 1–7 (TU 183.66–68) which discuss the utility of Stoic definitions of God; for Theodore, see H. Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus als Exegeten* (Freiburg: Herder, 1880), 122. Schaublin, *Untersuchungen*, 96–108 inquired into this further and specified that much of Theodore’s lexical material may be divided into what appears to be an Attic glossary and a Septuagint lexical tool. Schaublin and Neuschäfer established these traditions by referencing Homeric scholia and lexicographical works, principally those attributed to Hesychius, ‘Cyril’, and Photius.

26 Schaublin, *Untersuchungen*, 97. Mariès, *Études* does not compare Diodore’s glosses to late antique lexical traditions; while it is likely that Diodore used a tool similar to Theodore, the investigation is open.

suggesting a monastic-exegetical school environment in which grammar and spirituality converged around the explication of the biblical text. It is not difficult to imagine how such traditions were ideal material upon which a preacher like Chrysostom could enlarge. Yet we know little about how Chrysostom stood in relation to these traditions, which are difficult to reconstruct as they relate to the elusive Hesychian and Ps.-Cyrillian lexical works.²⁷ So, the present chapter endeavors to apply previous methods of paralleling lexical traditions among ancient authors to Chrysostom, while contextualizing his adaptation of these traditions.

1.2 *Selections of Chrysostom's Glosses in the Homilies on Genesis*

For the sake of understanding the phenomenon of word-study in John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis*, I present in Table 2 below 18 out of over 200 cases, arranged alphabetically according to Septuagint terms. In Column 1, I provide the biblical word on which he focuses. Column 2 extracts the gloss that Chrysostom gives to the word found in Column 1, and Column 3 is Hill's translation in FOC of the gloss which Chrysostom provides. Column 4 provides the biblical text in which the word in Column 1 appears, and Column 5 provides the references to the PG and FOC.

27 The available Greek lexical material is heavily interdependent. Of primary importance is the lexicon of Hesychius (SGLG 11/1–4); see the overview in Wilson, 'On the Transmission of the Greek lexica'. It is likely a fifth- or sixth-century compilation of earlier material from sources such as what the Suda, δ, 296b (BEKKER) calls the 'Comprehensive lexicon' (Λέξις παντοδαπή) of Diogenes which no longer survives. The work of Hesychius was interpolated by a collection of biblical glosses from the so-called 'Cyrill-lexicon', which refers to a Late Antique lexicon of unknown origin, contextualized in Matthaios, 'Greek Scholarship', 284–290. A critical edition of the Cyrill-lexicon is long awaited, and until then there are some partially edited texts and manuscripts, such as *Codex Bremensis G 11* (HAGEDORN) and the *ν-Recension* (ICS 4.94–135). The starting point for studying the Cyril-lexicon tradition is A.B. Drachmann, *Überlieferung des Cyrillglossars*, HfM 21/5 (Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard, 1936), but editions just listed supersede his study. For instance, he neglected the earliest witness of *Codex Bremensis*, which led Latte to miss it in his edition of the Hesychius lexicon. See further discussion of the interrelationship between Hesychius and the Cyril-lexicon in Cunningham, *Hesychii*, SGLG 11.XVII–XVIII and C. Alpers, 'Ein Handschriftenfund zum Cyrill-Glossar in der Staats und Universitätsbibliothek Bremen', in W. Hörandner–E. Trapp (eds.), *Lexicographica Byzantina*, Byzantina Vindobonensia 20 (Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991), 11–52. Other traditions witness to the Cyril-lexicon, but only in part, such as *ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ ΛΕΞΕΩΝ ΧΡΗΣΙΜΩΝ* (SGLG 10). Yet it is many of these entries from the so-called Cyril-lexicon which Schaublin identified as parallels to the glosses found in Theodore of Mopsuestia. Therefore, his conclusion that Theodore used several lexical tools must be approached tentatively.

TABLE 2 Select glosses in the *Homilies on Genesis*

Biblical word	Chrysostom's gloss	English translation	Genesis	PG; HILL
1. ἀκατασκεύαστος	ἀδιατύπων	Imperfect	1,2	53.31; 74.36
2. ἀνεζωπύρησε	ἀθρόον ἐνέαξε τῇ προ- θυμίᾳ	Suddenly takes on new vigor and heart	45,27	54.559; 87.244
3. ἀόρατος	ἀμόρφωτος	Formless	1,2	53.31; 74.36
4. ἀπέστη	ἀνεχώρησεν ... μετῆλ- θεν	He departed ... he transferred	12,7	53.296; 82.259
5. ἐβραρυπήσαν	ἀσθενεῖς κεκτημένον	Were weak	48,10	54.569; 87.260
6. ἔξελθε	κατάλιπε	Leave behind you	12,1	53.286; 82.243
7. ἐξέλιπε	ἐξηραμμένη ἡν, ἡ πηγῇ	The spring had dried up	18,12	53.383; 82.414
8. ἐμνήσθη	ᾤκτειρε ... ἤλευσεν	[God] took pity ... he had mercy	8,1	53.232; 82.150
9. ἐνεκότει	ἐνέκειτο, ἐπέμενεν	He was in that con- dition, he stayed that way	27,41	54.470; 87.89
10. ἐπείδεν	ἀεδέξατο, ἐπῆνεσε τὴν γνώμην	He accepted, he approved the attitude	4,4	53.155; 82.14
11. ἔφυγον	εἰς φυγὴν ἐτράπησαν	They were put to flight	14,11	53.325; 82.311
12. ἤτασε	δίκην, φησὶν, ἀπήτησε	It means imposed pun- ishment	12,17	53.301; 82.269
13. κατενύγησαν	ἐλυπήθησαν ... πάνυ χαλεπόν	They were distressed ... total misery	34,5	54.516; 87.170
14. στερέωμα	ὑδωρ πεπηγός	Congeaed water	1,6	53.42; 74.55
15. στρεφομένην	ὁδοὺς ἀποφραττούση	Barred the ways	3,24b	53.153; 82.10
16. σφαιρωτήρος	τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ ὑποδή- ματος τὸ εἰς ὃξὺ λήγον	The tip of the shoe because it comes to a point	14,21	53.329; 82.318
17. ὑψώθη	εὐπορος ἐγένετο	He became wealthy	26,13	54.457; 87.67
18. χορτασθήσονται	πληρώσουσιν	They will fulfil	Mt 5,6	53.207; 82.105

1.3 *Glossing Formulations and Verbs*

To appreciate the context of word study which Chrysostom wished to give in his *Homilies on Genesis*, several of the cases above which focus on Septuagint verbs may be considered. First, it is notable that he introduces some with the ‘instead of’ (ἀντὶ τοῦ) formula. Esau, deprived of his birthright (Gen 27,41), is

'angry', but in this context it means 'instead' that 'he stayed that way', a remarkable case of a Chrysostomian gloss paralleled in an attic lexicon.²⁸ To mark his synonyms, Chrysostom also uses other generic formulations, hardly typical of a single author, designating 'this' or what a word 'is': 'what is this' (τί ἐστὶ),²⁹ or 'this is' (τοῦτ' ἐστίν).³⁰ For instance, when Abram journeys through the desert, the text uses transition verbs like 'He moved on from there' (Gen 12,7).³¹ 'What is this,' Chrysostom asks. He signals an answer by creating an analogy using the comparative particle ὥς: it is 'as saying' that 'he departed from there and transferred to another place'. In the same passage, he remarks on Gen 12,9, 'He pitched camp'. For Chrysostom this is 'a strange expression [ξένη λέξις] for sacred Scripture to use' and it connotes 'an unencumbered state', clearly emphasizing Abram's transitory nature. Indeed, both of these terms appears to have been strange for at least some other late-ancient readers, as Chrysostom's gloss of Gen 12,7 and 12,9 are found in the Hesychius *Lexicon*.³² Having seen that the term 'strange' or 'foreign' was used by grammarians to identify words for glossing and provision of synonyms, Chrysostom's use of this expression in conjunction with a lexical tradition in the public format of the *Homilies on Genesis* takes on new meaning. Further, the analogical methodology is applied: 'just as' (καθάπερ) the custom in war, 'so too now' (οὕτω καὶ νῦν) the patriarch Abraham demonstrates his virtuous and ascetic lifestyle, capable of pitching camp swiftly and moving on unencumbered. Here, the *skopos* is clear. Similarly, when Chrysostom explains '[Jacob's] spirit gained new life' (45,27), this

28 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 53.5 (PG 54.470; FOC 87.89): 'he was angry' (ἐνεκότει, from ἐγκοτέω; see Lust–Eynikel–Hauspie, *Lexicon*, ad loc.) → 'anger' ὀργή; Hesychius, *Lex.* ε' 252 (HAL 2.9) has an interpolation on the term ἐγκότημα: a Biblical gloss on Jer 31.39, ὀργή. But Chrysostom also says it means 'he was in that condition, he stayed that way' (ἐνέκειτο, ἐπέμενεν). Apion, *Frag. gloss. Hom.* 74 (SGLG 3.252) reports that Aristarchus glossed a use of 'wrath' (μῆνις) in the Homeric text with the same terms used by John Chrysostom: 'a long standing grudge, from remaining in that condition, or rather, staying that way' (κότος πολυχρόνιος, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπιμένειν ἡγούν ἐγκεῖσθαι). See also John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 52.1 (54.457).

29 Ibid. 18.5 (PG 53.155); 26.3 (53.232); 32.3 (53.296); 59.2 (54.516); 65.1 (54.559).

30 Ibid. 24.1 (PG 53.207); 35.6 (53.329).

31 Ibid. 32.3 (PG 53.296; FOC 82.259).

32 Ibid. (FOC 82.261): 'he pitched camp' (ἐστρατοπέδευσεν) (Gen 12,9) → 'unencumbered' (τὸ εὐζωνον), belonging to soldiers (στρατιῶται). A biblical gloss on the word *soldiers* in Jos 4.13, here ἑνοπλοὶ, found in Hesychius, *Lex.* ε' 6815 (HAL 2.224) also explained soldiers with the terminology of unencumbered (εὐζωνοί). In John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 32.3 (PG 53.296; FOC 82.259–260): 'he moved on' (ἀπέστη) (Gen 12,17) → 'he transferred' (μετῆλθεν); Hesychius, *Lex.* M' 538 (HAL 2.638): Μεθέστηκεν ἀφέστηκεν, μετῆλθεν; Hesychius attributes this to Euripides, *Med.* 898. Hesychius gives prf. / pluprf. Of ἀφίστημι, whereas in Gen 12,7 it is the aorist.

is 'just as' when the light of a lamp emits a brighter flame just before dying out finally.³³ The analogical method of the rhetorical grammarian is seen further when Chrysostom compares terms for God having 'seen' Abel: it is, 'as if someone might say' (ὥς ἂν εἴποι τις) that he accepted Abel, and this connects to Chrysostom's interest in Abel's 'mindset'.³⁴

Chrysostom included attention markers to guide his audience's comprehension of his glosses. From words glossed in Table 2, there is the expression 'not simply' (οὐχ ἀπλῶς),³⁵ which Diodore used frequently in his *Commentary on the Psalms* to the same effect.³⁶ As Nünlist remarked for the scholia, there was also the odd practice of glossing words that were not likely difficult to grasp. It does not get more straightforward than the word 'they fled' (Gen 14,11) from battle, describing the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah. But for Chrysostom it is 'not simply' that they fled; they were 'put to flight'. The immediate rhetorical context is illuminating, as Chrysostom explains that there is 'profit in knowing this' (ὄφελος ἀπὸ τοῦ γινῶναι), for we see that God's people ward off a barbarian army.³⁷ Thus even the most basic of word-explanations seems to fit well with Hidal's assessment of how comparative synonyms and paraphrases were an essential aspect of Chrysostom's exegetical procedure and search for the *skopos* of the text. Sometimes the 'not simply' could be applied to his audience directly, such as when he says, 'Let us not simply pass by [παράδράμωμεν]' but 'let us understand how great [ἐννοήσωμεν ὅσος] the weight [ὄγκος] of the word', changing the command for Abram to 'go forth' to 'leave behind' (Gen 12,1), harkening to the drama of exile and sojourning which magnifies God's providence as seen in the case study of *Homily 37 on Genesis*.³⁸

Glosses on verbs can similarly heighten the dramatic action of the narrative by creating sympathy and understanding between audience and character. Another context finds Sarah, the wife of Abraham, laughing at the divine promise that she will conceive a child in her barren state. Chrysostom wants his audience to realize just how barren she is in order to explain this laughter, for it does not appear suitable for a righteous character to laugh at the divine. He addresses the verb in Gen 18,11, literally that she 'ceased [ἐξέλιπεν] to have what was proper to women'.³⁹ His gloss: 'the spring [πηγή] had shriveled [ἐξη-

33 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 65.1 (PG 54.559; FOC 87.244, paraphrased).

34 Ibid. 18.5 (PG 53.155).

35 Ibid. 2.4 (PG 53.31); 18.3 (53.152); 31.3 (53.286); 35.3 (53.325); 53.5 (PG 54.470).

36 Mariès, *Études*, 111.

37 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 35.3 (PG 53.325).

38 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 31.3 (PG 53.286; FOC 82.243, modified).

39 Harl, *La Genèse*, 174.

ραμμένη]’, a verb found also describing the shriveled hand of a crippled person in Mk 3,3. Remarkably, Chrysostom seems to have had consistent thought regarding the parallel meaning of these two verbs based on Greek bible study. For the text of Gen 8,13–14 states that the earth had ‘dried up’ after the flood, but it there used the same verb describing Sarah’s barrenness, ἐξέλιπεν, literally ‘it ceased’ or ‘it left behind’. For the context of the flood, this clearly means ‘dried up’. Similarly, the prophet Isaiah likens God’s presence to Israel as a ‘spring [πηγή]’ that will not cease [ἐξέλιπεν], the implication being that it will not go dry. Using the gospel-based metaphor as a gloss on the common Septuagint expression enables him to create a level of empathy for Sarah with thick metaphorical registers. If her capacity to bear children was really dried up entirely, then her laughing at the notion of conceiving children is understandable.

1.4 *Psychology, Nature, and Anthropomorphism*

We may further classify Chrysostom’s concerns from the sample glosses of Table 2 by psychological or emotional ideas, natural or scientific terms, and anthropomorphisms.

To teach the emotions, we know that Chrysostom employed psychological analysis of biblical narratives to assesses characters’ moods, rationalities, hopes, fears, and desires.⁴⁰ Above it was noticed that a gloss on anger related to an ancient Attic glossary. He often used such analysis to condition his own audience to make the same moral judgement about the situation as he did. So, in a particularly shocking episode, a certain Sychem is smitten with lust for Deinah, the daughter of the patriarch Jacob and his wife Leah. Sychem rapes Deinah; her brothers are, in the words of the Gen 34,5, ‘shocked’. But this obvious reaction does not cover it completely for Chrysostom. He adds to this notion of surprise a sense of sorrow by providing the synonym ‘they were distressed’, a common synonym for this verb in Hesychius and other Late Antique Christian authors that implied compunction, but here Chrysostom also provides the dimension of ‘total misery’ (πάνυ χαλεπόν) inflicting the heart.⁴¹ By providing his gloss in a similar word form as the Septuagint term (both end in

40 B. Leyerle, *The Narrative Shape of Emotion in the Preaching of John Chrysostom*, CLA 10 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2020).

41 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 59,2 (PG 54.516; FOC 87.170): ‘they were shocked’ (κατενύγησαν) → ‘they were distressed’ (ἐλυπήθησαν). The tradition of this gloss is explored in Harl, ‘Componction’, 85. For example, Ps.-Athanasius, *Comm. Ps. ad 108,17* (PG 27.457–458): ‘made contrite in heart for having died, instead of made sorrowing’ (καταπενυγμένον τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ θανατῶσαι. Ἀντὶ τοῦ, λυπούμενον); Hesychius, *Lex. λ’* 1304 (HAL 2.430) is interpolated with a Biblical gloss on Ps 4,5, ἐλυπήθητε, providing κατενύγητε.

-ησαν) Chrysostom's precision enables his audience to make the clear conceptual leap—in case there was doubt!—to viewing this episode as morally repugnant. In several cases this apparent precision results in him inserting spiritual and psychological content into a word that does not necessarily recommend it. Quoting the beatitude in Mt 5,6 that those who are hungry 'shall be filled,' he says that this word means 'they shall be satisfied,' using another word ending in -ήσονται, for 'they will fulfill their spiritual desire [ἐπιθυμίαν τὴν πνευματικὴν].'⁴² Here he retains the same word form as the verb of Mt 5,6, posing his exegesis as a form of precise lexical comparison, and indeed, 'satisfied' for 'fulfilled' is a common lexical gloss in patristic exegetical traditions.⁴³ Chrysostom uses it for amplification: he moves from a word involving hunger to a psychological state involving spiritual desire. Another glossular inference not so obvious from the surface reading comes when God bids Abram to 'go forth from' the lands of his forefathers and kinsmen (Gen 12,1).⁴⁴ Chrysostom views this command as meaning 'leave behind you what is obvious [τὰ δῆλα] and accepted.'⁴⁵ Chrysostom thinks that this means that right from the beginning of Abraham's story, he is trained to look towards future realities. This is not an outlandish reading of the story on the whole, but it is a considerable change of meaning from the clear sense of the text commanding Abraham to depart from his homeland—it is a strong case of reverting back to the *skopos*. We thereby see that difficult biblical words as such do not attract his attention in every case; it is the words whose meaning is unclear based on the context of the passage or that may easily be manipulated for his pastoral goals of psychological formation.

The *Homilies on Genesis* also offer some explanations of words connoting natural or scientific phenomena, as the early chapters of Genesis are particularly rich in such words. Gen 1,2, for instance, describes the earth as 'invisible and incomplete'. Chrysostom changes this to 'formless and shapeless'. It is not likely that his audience failed to understand the term 'invisible'. Rather, Chrysostom glosses here because he sees an opportunity. As such the biblical word 'invisible' may be construed to mean that it was not visible to the eye at all, that is, belonging to some other dimension which might lead to metaphysical speculation 'from underlying matter' (ἐξ ὑποκειμένης ὕλης). Chrysostom wishes

42 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 24.1 (PG 53.207).

43 Chrysostom changes 'They shall be filled' (χορτασθήσονται) (Mt 5,6) → 'They shall be fulfilled' (ἐμπλησθήσονται); Eusebius of Caesarea, *Comm. in Ps.* 16,13–14 (PG 23.165): ἐχορτάσθησαν, ἀλλ' ἐμπλησθέντες. Hesychius, *Lex.* κ' 3606 (HAL 2.511): κορέσαι. Διεργάσασθαι. Πληρώσαι, χορτάσαι, and ε' 2457 (HAL 2.81), ἐμπίπλαται (Sir 4,8) interpolated with πληροῦται, χορτάζεται.

44 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 31.3 (PG 53.286).

45 *Ibid.*, PG 53.286; FOC 82.243.

to remove this possibility of understanding. There is a twofold dialogue with patristic exegetical traditions here. First, there is the lexical tradition: Chrysostom's gloss is found also in a sermon of Basil of Caesarea and the Hesychius *Lexicon* who attributes the reading to Sophocles.⁴⁶ Basil emphasizes the ugliness of matter, whereas Chrysostom uses the new expression 'formless and shapeless' to emphasize the inability of matter to provide for itself. Second, other Christians had speculated about this notion of creation 'from underlying matter' in relation to Gen 1,2.⁴⁷ Chrysostom wants his audience to be sure that Moses did not make such speculations because he was teaching materially-minded Jews. Instead, Moses merely wanted to show the insufficiency of the earth to adorn itself. Chrysostom's change from 'invisible and incomplete' to 'formless and shapeless' thereby renders the Septuagint term with a negative content in order to teach his audience that the earth's beauty and productivity

46 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 2.4 (PG 53.31): 'invisible and incomplete' (ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος) (Gen 1,2) 'formless and shapeless' (ἀμόρφωτον καὶ ἀδιατύπωτον); Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 2.2 (GCS NF 2.23,15): 'without form, the shapeless ugliness' (ἀμορφίαν, τὸ ἀδιατύπωτον αἶσχος); Hesychius, *Lex.* A' 3760 (SGLG 11/1.175), ἀμόρφωτον, ἀδιατύπωτον. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστη τῷ ἐν Σικυῶνι.

47 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 2.2 (PG 53.28). Gregory of Nyssa, *Hex.* 17 (GNO 4/1.28–29) makes rich use of the Hexaplaric variants to Gen 1,2 to build a considerable metaphysical picture around the 'invisible' earth; for explication see M. Alexandre, 'L'exégèse de Gen. 1,1–2a dans l'*In Hexaemeron* de Grégoire de Nyse: Deux approches du problème de la matière', in H. Dörrie (ed.), *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 175. There were considerable problems associated with such discussions. Earlier, Hermogenes apparently held that matter, comprised in Gen 1,2, was uncreated. The earliest testimony to this view is in Tertullian, *Adv. Hermog.* 4.1 (CCSL 1.400), with discussions in G. May, *Schöpfung aus dem Nichts. Die Entstehung der Lehre von der Creatio ex nihilo*, AK 48 (Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978), 147; P. Nautin, 'Genèse 1, 1–2, de Justin à Origène', in *In Principio. Interprétations des premiers versets de la Genèse*, EAA 38 (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1973), 82–83, and B. Bennet, 'Didymus the Blind's Knowledge of Manichaeism' in P. Mirecki–J. BeDuhn (eds.), *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, NHMS 50 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 50–55. Throughout Tertullian's treatise, Bennet determined three exegetical remarks formulated by Hermogenes on Gen 1,2: (a) the earth issues from the eternal matter; (b) the imperfect ἦν justifies the idea that this matter is indeed eternal; and (c) *invisibilis et rudis*, the Latin translation of Gen 1,2, alludes to this eternal matter. Theophilus, *Ad Aut.* 2.4 (GRANT, 26) reacted to Hermogenes also, and probably derived from him the terminology ὕλην ἀγέννητον for discussing the problem of 'matter' in Genesis 1. Closer to Chrysostom's fourth-century context, Didymus attributes a similar problem to Mani, particularly point (b) mentioned above. The fragment is found in Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad 1,1* (GCS NF 22.14): 'The God-fighter Mani says that this "It was" is clearly the unoriginated of matter, and 'was' laying before the "He made"' (ὁ δὲ θεομάχος Μάνης τὸ »ἦν« φησι δηλοῦν τὸ τῆς ὕλης ἀγέννητον, καίτοι πρόκειται τοῦ »ἦν« τὸ ἐποίησεν). The reading is lost in the Tura papyrus, but ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλ[ης] (Wis 11,17) is mentioned at Didymus, *In Gen.* 3,11–13 (SC 233.38).

is God's responsibility alone. A complex amalgam of linguistic and apologetic-exegetical traditions gets deployed for Chrysostom's framing of intellectual boundaries for his community.

More difficult terms are also targeted and captured into Chrysostom's wider rhetorical designs, sometimes with surprising ingenuity. In his gloss of Gen 48,10, he changes an apparent neologism,⁴⁸ where the biblical text explains eyes that are 'faded' (ἐβαρυνώπησαν), into eyes that are made 'weak' (ἀσθενεῖς).⁴⁹ The gloss is a metaphorical expression concerning Joseph's waning eyesight. The same gloss is reported in Hesychius,⁵⁰ but more remarkable is that Chrysostom's glossing of this text is different than that of Origen and Cyril of Alexandria, for instance, who simply say that the eyes 'were unable to see',⁵¹ a restatement of the biblical text. The vantage point of Chrysostom's subtle gloss on this difficult term thereby illuminates a corner of patristic exegetical traditions and their shared resources.

Why Chrysostom commented in this way may be explored from the vantage point of another difficult term. The 'shoestrapp' (σφαιρωτήρ) in Gen 14,21, given its Semitic etymon,⁵² was likely downright difficult to understand for his audience. He provides an explanation of what it is: 'a shoestrapp is the tip of the shoe because it comes to a point', a custom which Chrysostom attributes to 'the Barbarians'. As such, this explanation belonged to an ancient lexical tradition, remarkably deployed verbatim in Cyril and Chrysostom alike.⁵³ But then, using the attention he has presumably garnered by his explanation of this bizarre term, he explains how this 'shoestrapp' magnifies Abraham's honor in dealing with military alliances and foreign relations, even barbarous ones. Needing to

48 Harl, *La Genèse*, 303; Lust-Eynikel-Hauspie, *Lexicon*, ad loc.

49 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 66.3 (PG 54.569; FOC 87.260).

50 Hesychius, *Lex.* ε' 62 (HAL 2.3), ἐβαρυνώπησαν interpolated with a Biblical gloss on Gen 48,10, ἀσθενεῖς ἐγένοντο οἱ ὀφθαλμοί.

51 Origen, *Cat.* 2087 (TEG 4.327): μὴ δύνασθαι βλέπειν; Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaph. Gen.* 6.3 (PG 69.332): οὐκ ἠδύναντο βλέπειν.

52 Masson, 'Σφαίρα, σφαιρωτήρ: problème' which suggests the underlying טִישׁ; cf. Ex 25,31; discussion in Harl, *Genèse*, 161 and A. Le Boulluec-P. Sandevor, *L'Exode*, BA 2 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989), 262–263.

53 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 35.6 (PG 53.329; FOC 82.318): τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ ὑποδήματος τὸ εἰς ὃν λήγον· τοιοῦτοι γὰρ ἔθος ἔχουσι κεχρησθαι οἱ βάρβαροι. Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. in Luc.* 5,16 (PG 72.520) explains the 'shoestrapp' of Jesus which John the Baptist admits he cannot untie (Lk 5,16): οὕτω δὲ εἰώθασιν λέγειν τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ ὑποδήματος, τὸ εἰς ὃν λήγον· τοιοῦτοι γὰρ ἔθος ἔχοντες οἱ βάρβαροι; cf. ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ, σ' 397 (SGLG 10.455): 'the latchet of the sandal, the strap of the shoe' (σανδαλίου ζινίχιον, οἷον τὸ λώριον τοῦ ὑποδήματος), of which an abbreviated form is known in Hesychius, *Lex.* σ' 2836 (SGLG 11/3.391), σφαιρωτήρ ζινίχιον σανδαλίου, a Biblical gloss interpolation on Gen 14,23.

pay some debts to his former ally, Abraham says in Chrysostom's voice, 'I will not take even a string or shoestrap of all your goods'; he will take absolutely nothing that belongs to the king of Sodom, not even a 'chance item' (οὐδὲ τὸ τυχόν).⁵⁴ The *skopos* of 'shoestrap' concerns Abraham's virtue, and the paraphrase explanation rooted in a lexical tradition enables the connection.

Exegetical tradition, linguistic glossing, and moral *paraenesis* combine further in regard to his handling of anthropomorphisms. When God 'saw' Abel's sacrifice (Gen 4,4), in *Homily 18 on Genesis* Chrysostom explains, 'If we would speak about God and dare to open our mouth concerning that pure nature, then being yet human we would be able to understand [νοεῖν] these things only through language [γλώττης]'.⁵⁵ This is quite a setup for a single word, but for Chrysostom it resonates with other concepts in the bible that need to be drawn out. In fact, he directs his audience, 'Do you see [ὄρα] how this fulfills [πληροῦται] what is said in the Gospel', namely that the last shall be first (cf. Mt 20,16)? This is a striking exegetical move, as he makes God's 'seeing' Abel as comparable to God's metaphorical seeing of those who are last; a single word in the Old Testament finds its *skopos* in a moral principle of the New Testament. It is the provision of synonyms which provides the link, for the expression 'he saw' actually means that God 'received, praised Abel's mindset [γνώμην]'. By this Chrysostom emphasizes that God did not envision Abel's sacrifice at all, but like the entirety of moral history stretching to the gospels, God had his eyes on those with a rectified mindset. This is the definitive proof he needs to teach why the sacrifice of Cain failed in the eyes of the divine: he was not in an inner disposition of humility, of those who are 'last'. In this Chrysostom connects with what Grypeou and Spurling have identified as the Christian exegetical tradition of relating Abel's blood to the martyrs.⁵⁶ Later in *Homily 19 on Genesis*, Chrysostom quotes Heb 11,4 which mentions that Abel's blood 'still speaks', and this is then elaborated into a martyr-reception image, in which after his death Abel joins the choirs of angels, courts of heaven, and reigns with Christ.⁵⁷ Chrysostom thereby layers the intended *skopos*, extending from the humility emphasis in New Testament teaching to its practical manifestation as sharing the very 'mindset' of the martyrs.

54 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 35.6 (PG 53.329; FOC 82.318, modified).

55 Ibid., 18.5 (PG 53.155; FOC 82.14–15).

56 E. Grypeou–H. Spurling, *The Book of Genesis in Late Antiquity: Encounters Between Jewish and Christian Exegetes*, JCPs 24 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 118–119.

57 Ibid., 19.6 (PG 53.165). On the *topos* of heavenly martyr-reception, see A. Recheis, *Engel, Tod und Seelenreise: das Wirken der Gester beim Heimgang des Menschen in der Lehre der Alexandrinischen und Kappadokischen Väter*, TeT 4 (Roma: Storia e letteratura, 1958).

The same pattern occurs in another anthropomorphism, this one a *locus classicus*, making it a clear case by which to see Chrysostom's dialoguing with exegetical traditions through linguistic explanation. By Gen 8,1, Noah and his family have survived the flood, and the 150 days during which water prevailed upon the surface of the earth are over. To transition scenes in the narrative, the text tells that God was 'mindful' of the Noachic clan, a word with problematic implications for many other Greek commentators.⁵⁸ Chrysostom is quick to defend the term by casting it into the *skopos* of divine providence. After mentioning the 'accommodation' (συγκατάβασιν) of scripture, he invites his beloved congregation to 'understand [what is said] in a sense befitting God [Θεοπρεπῶς νοῶμεν]', the exact expression used by Didymus to discuss this term in Gen 8,1.⁵⁹ Whereas Didymus explained it as God's 'memory', and Eusebius of Emesa used Syriac and Hebrew translations to gather the impression of God 'deliberating with himself', Chrysostom goes on: do 'not interpret the concreteness of the expression from the viewpoint of the limitations of our human condition. I mean, as far as the ineffable essence is concerned, the word is improper, but as far as our limitations are concerned, the expression is made appropriately'.⁶⁰ He modulates his addresses, using 'our' and first-person plural verbs, implicating himself and the language of the text in the conceptual field of weakness and dependence on the higher power of providence. From here, the meaning of 'mindful' is clearly 'he took pity, he had mercy on him', a repetition riveting on the minds of his audience the merciful character of the divine providence and the common lot shared by all humans. From a shared exegetical culture of linguistic explanation, Chrysostom discerns his own *skopos* from the words of the biblical text.

1.5 Summary

It is useful to recall the comments made by Rylaarsdam concerning Chrysostom's anthropomorphisms: '[For Chrysostom] the linguistic signs [of the bible] referred to realities regarding God and his plan of salvation. Discerning that to which the words referred was a more fundamental concern to Chrysostom than determining the so-called "senses of Scripture" (literal, typological, allegorical, etc.)'.⁶¹ This section has established in detail one dimension of *how* Chrysostom accomplished this: through the deploying of learned lexical tradi-

58 The word is discussed as an anthropomorphism in Philo, *Q. Gen.* 2.26 (OPA 33.100) and Didymus, *In Gen.* 194,15–23 (SC 244.122); Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 48a (TEG 15.94).

59 Didymus, *In Gen.* 194,15 (SC 244.122) Θεοπρεπῶς ἀκουστέον.

60 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 26.3 (PG 53.232; FOC 82.149–150).

61 Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy*, 122.

tions and combining them with patristic exegetical discussions. An important view on text-webs and their accumulation is afforded, as we see that the distinction between lexical study and apologetic-exegetical discussion is not always easy to sustain. The case of anthropomorphic problems illustrates this well. In cases like the glossing of 'formless and without void', the proximity of Basil and Chrysostom is remarkable, both in their linguistic glossing and building of this tradition into their rejection of uncreated matter. But the same gloss of Gen 1,2 functions in different ways, for Basil to emphasize ugliness, for Chrysostom powerlessness. Finally, while Rylaarsadam, and like him Hidal, were right to judge that glossing for Chrysostom most often reverts back to the practice of determining a *skopos*, this section has showed that we may more accurately speak of *skopoi* in relation to paraphrase and glossing. That is, while accommodation, providence, precision, and other such regularly repeated Chrysostomian terminology are involved in the construction of *skopos*, each discourse possesses a particular take on this 'overall meaning'; the *skopoi* of particular discourses are conditioned by the exegetical traditions of which Chrysostom was aware given the relevant biblical texts.

2 Habits of Scripture

Developing discussions begun in Aristarchus, Homeric commentators deployed the concept of Homer's 'idiom' (ιδίωμα), 'use' (συνήθεια), or 'habit' (ἔθος) to clarify what could be established as regularly occurring features or difficult aspects of the text. 'Throughout' (διὰ παντός) the text of Homer, records a fragment of commentary from an early papyrus, the poet works 'according to a peculiar use' (κατὰ ἰδίαν συνήθειαν) of making a list and then discussing the items in that list by starting with the last item on it.⁶² Some agreed: one could 'always' (ἀεί) find this feature in Homer. But later scholiasts disagreed: one could apparently find examples where Homer did not use this technique of 'reverse order'.⁶³ Other discussions of formal features were interested in how one text compared with other sources or everyday language use,⁶⁴ the lat-

62 *Schol. pap. Il. Ad 2,763* (LONDON, 165).

63 Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic*, 326–329; cf. K. McNamee, 'Aristarchus and "Everyman's" Homer', *GRBS* 22.3 (1981), 249–250.

64 Neuschäfer, *Origenes*, 143. Aristarchus' predecessor, Zenodotus likely produced a work on the 'use' (συνήθεια) of Homeric words alongside his text-critical annotations, studied in K. Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos*, UaLG 16 (Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977).

ter especially becoming the interest of later grammarians.⁶⁵ Patristic exegetes developed these techniques in two interrelated ways.

As Schäublin noted, Theodore and Diodore adopted these concerns as part of the Antiochene reception of the Origenian-Eusebian legacy of biblical exegesis on the basis of the knowledge of alternate versions of the Old Testament, discussed in Chapter 1. In particular, Theodore often used lexical traditions, such as those just studied, to establish the idiom, use, or habit of the biblical text (especially the Psalms).⁶⁶ Theodore catalogued the 'idioms' of the Septuagint, which documented its concision of expression. In distinction from his predecessor Eusebius of Emesa, he believed that by mastering these he could arrive at the sense of the original, what Kamesar has called the 'Greek method'.⁶⁷

On the other hand—but not in a wholly isolated way—this philological approach to the Greek bible in Chrysostom's time was also conditioned by more apologetic takes. In a response to Celsus, Origen had already suggested that the crude, obvious meanings of the bible are comparable to 'usual aspects' (συνήθεις) of language, so that 'the multitudes' may be taught to comprehend the deeper meanings, a point which Basil of Caesarea would emphasize contributes to the universal spread of the Gospel.⁶⁸ Building on Astruc-Morize's and Le Boulluec's insight into the connection between Origen and Chrysostom, Chapter 2 of this volume has already explored how in the *Homilies on Genesis*, Chrysostom expressed a variety of hermeneutical metaphors in relation to the obscurity of the bible, such as the weakness of the hearer or the hidden treasures concealed beneath the surface.⁶⁹

65 Sextus Empiricus, *Adv. Math.* 1.84 (SEO 3.23,1–2; BLANK, 19) reports the position of first-century B.C.E. Demetrius Chlorus that grammatical science was 'a knowledge of the words in common use' (κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν συνήθειαν λέξεων εἰδησις).

66 The claim was made by Schäublin, *Untersuchungen*, regarding Diodore and Theodore and developed further by Neuschäfer, *Origenes*, 1:143–155. For an outline of Diodore's mention of scriptural habits in the *Commentary on the Psalms*, see Mariès, *Études*, 106–109. While there are grounds for confidence in the attribution to Diodore, the authorship of this text is still an open question. See Olivier, *Commentarii*, CCSG 15.LXXIII–CVIII and E. Schweizer, 'Diodor von Tarsus als Exeget', *ZNW* 40 (1941), 45.

67 Kamesar, *Jerome*, 175; The catalogue is lost, but an attempted reconstruction is in Devreesse, *Essai*, 55–68, esp. 59–60. Adrian's *Introduction* codifies and expands many of these principles. When explaining the habit of Scripture, Theodore often references the Hebrew language, but this is because he believed that in explaining habits before him in the Septuagint, he was explaining the original Hebrew.

68 Origen, *C. Cels.* 7.60 (SVC 54.511,22–26). G.J.M. Bartelink, 'Observations de saint Basile sur la langue biblique et théologique', *VC* 17.2 (1963), 90.

69 Astruc-Morize–Le Boulluec, 'Le sens caché', 15–16; 23–24.

We may add at this point that these metaphors were often invoked in relation to the 'habit' of Scripture. Thus, bringing up the Psalter text which casts the divine sayings as more valuable than gold and sweeter than honey, Chrysostom marks as 'a constant habit' (ἔθος αἰεί) that the 'spiritual stones' of scripture lie in its use of everyday language to reference the 'benefit' (ὠφέλειαν) beyond material things.⁷⁰ A systematic consideration of the *Homilies on Genesis* will illuminate how Chrysostom extended this principle to study the bible's features of speech by referencing and comparing the concept of 'habit', 'use', and 'idiom', as Theodore and other patristic exegetes. But as Origen had expressed, a key point to which Chrysostom returns regularly is the clarification of scripture's language in regard to 'our'—not just its own—habits, so as to lead all men towards knowledge of spiritual realities. First, we consider the ways Chrysostom formulated Scriptural habits and then consider in greater detail the contents of what he identified as such and how these could contribute to the construction of a particular *skopos*.

2.1 Formulations and Rhetorical Contexts of 'Habit'

Chrysostom formulated his understanding of scriptural habits with the same expressions found in other exegetes and commentators on Homer. One of the most telling points in this regard is the modification of 'habit' with adverbs like 'frequently' (πολλάκις), 'constant' (αἰεί) and 'in many places' (πολλαχοῦ).⁷¹ In these cases, quotations from other parts of Scripture such as the Pauline epistles support the notion, often providing for his audience the impression that more examples may be found. Origen, Basil, Diodore, Theodore, and Adrian, all use these adverbs to modify their understanding of a specific Scriptural habits.⁷² Origen, for instance, shows that the word 'day' can 'in many places' refer to 'all ages'.⁷³

70 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 14.1 (PG 53.111; FOC 74.181): For this metaphor in patristic authors A. Goulon, 'Quelques aspects du symbolisme de l'abeille et du miel à l'époque patristique', in L. Holtz–J.-C. Fredouille (eds.), *De Tertullien aux mozarabes. Mélanges offerts à Jacques Fontaine à l'occasion de son 70^e anniversaire*, EAA 132 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1992), 525–535; A. van den Bunt, 'Milk and Honey in the Theology of Clement of Alexandria', in H.J. Auf der Maur et al. (eds.), *Fides sacramenti sacramentum fidei: Studies in Honor of Pieter Smulders* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1981), 27–39. For Chrysostom's construction of a 'spiritual universe' with the visual imagery of scripture, see Brottier, 'πνευματικός'.

71 E.g. John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 22.3 (PG 53.190); 13.4 (53.109); 14.1 (53.111); 66.2 (54.567); 67.2 (54.574); see also in *In Matt. hom.* 10 (HM 1:123d): *In ep. ii ad Tim. hom.* 3 (EP 6.186d).

72 Origen, *C. Cels.* 6.59 (SVC 54.436,25–26): 'earth' in the bible can 'in many places' (πολλαχοῦ) go by the name 'cosmos'; Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 2.8 (GCS NF 2.34,20–24), where the cycle of morning and evening constitutes one day and is thus a standard 'use' (συνήθειαν) of measurement found in the whole (ἐν πάσῃ) of scripture. He cites Ps 89,10, 22,6 and Gen

Christian exegetes also shared common verbal formulations in mentioning these habits. It was a habit for scripture to ‘use’ ([κε]χρησθαι) or to ‘call’ (ὀνομάζειν / καλεῖν) certain ideas in specific ways, for Chrysostom such as the bible ‘using’ the verb ‘to place’ with the sense ‘set in motion’ as in when God ‘placed’ Adam in the garden (Gen 2,9) and the stars in the sky (Gen 1,17).⁷⁴ Again, Origen, Diodore, and Theodore use these verbs to study the habit of the biblical text.⁷⁵ Theodore, for instance, explains that it is a Hebrew idiom (ἰδιῶμα ἑβραϊκὸν) not ‘to use’ comparative particles like ‘just as’ (ὥς) when making a poetic simile, illustrated by some cases from the minor prophets.⁷⁶

Finally, sometimes Chrysostom used the form of comparing aspects of biblical language to what appears to be a more colloquial expression. Most of these comments focus on verbal expressions, nouns, and adverbs, so it is worth dwelling on these at some length.

‘As here’ in the text, he says about the expression ‘the sons of your fathers’ (Gen 27,29), ‘so one might say’ (ὥς ἂν εἴποι τις) that it means those coming from the seed of Esau.⁷⁷ To set up this comparison, he uses a series of ὥς particles to make clear how the bible’s language might align with colloquial speech. As Neuschäfer identified, Origen operated similarly. In his commentary on Ephesians, he finds a bizarre use of the word ‘bitterness’ in Eph 4,31. He discusses how Paul uses the word in comparison with ‘how we say it’ (καθὸ λέγομεν).⁷⁸ He knows that we normally use it to indicate something that is opposite to sweet, but here Paul applies this idea as a moral metaphor, that is the ‘feature’ (συνήθεια) of viewing men who are bitter.

It is difficult to gain a sense of what, exactly, qualified in the minds of Late Antique authors as obscure for comprehension and so requiring recourse to habit for explanation. By way of depicting the diversity of biblical terms that received attention, I have quantified in Appendix 2 a small list of nouns and

47,9 to prove his point, discussed in Bartelink, ‘Observations’; Diodore, *Comm. in Ps. ad* 47,9d, l.79–80 (CCSG 6.288): ‘It is a habit [ἔθος] of scripture to call everywhere [πολλαχού] “ages” as “coming times”’; Theodore, *Comm. in Ps.* 20,14 (ST 93.120,5–6); Devreesse, *Essai*, 60; Martens, *Adrian’s Introduction*, 28.

73 Origen, *De orat.* 27.13 (GCS 3.372,10–11).

74 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 13.4 (PG 53.109); Scripture ‘calls’ (καλεῖν) human beings sons of God in *ibid.*, 22.3 (53.189) and 65.3 (54.562).

75 Origen, *C. Cels.* 6.70 (SVC 54.447,13–14), to distinguish from perceptible things, it is a ‘habit’ (ἔθος) of scripture ‘to name’ (ὀνομάζειν) intelligible things by ‘spirit’ or spiritual, with Johannine and Pauline citations; Diodore, *Comm. in Ps.* 47,5, l.41 (CCSG 6.286), it is a ‘habit’ (ἔθος) for scripture to call ‘kingdoms’ as ‘powers.’

76 Theodore, *Comm. in Ps.* 32,7b (ST 93.149,15–17).

77 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 53.3 (PG 54.468).

78 Origen, *In Eph.* 22,9–19 (*JThS* 3.556–557); Neuschäfer, *Origenes*, 144.

adverbs throughout the works of Basil, Diodore, Chrysostom, Theodore, Origen. The impression of these cases is that mention of 'habit' was primarily a rhetorical tool by which exegetes pointed to a particular *skopos* pertaining to the verse, less so a response to words that were downright difficult to understand—though these are not to be excluded. For our purposes, it is worth considering at greater length how such formulations could converge with other aspects of Chrysostom's engagement with patristic exegetical culture which we have previously noted.

Late Antique audiences likely struggled with Hebrew literalisms, such as the 'opening of the eyes' as a metaphorical way of expressing the act of understanding.⁷⁹ A comment from Diodore on Psalm 16,2 confirms this general impression, as 'Let my eyes behold upright things' is a speech 'habit' connoting the act of judging things correctly.⁸⁰ In *Homily 16 on Genesis*, Chrysostom comes across the expression that the eyes of Adam and Eve were 'opened' (Gen 3,7). A vexing problem (ζήτημα), he proposes to investigate the habit (ἔθος) of scripture in speaking this way.⁸¹ In fact, he says, it occurs like this everywhere (ἀλλαχοῦ). As an example, he cites the same expression in Gen 21,19, where Hagar's 'eyes were opened' to the dangerous neglect of her infant, Ishmael. In the case of Adam and Eve it is nakedness and the loss of previous glory which Chrysostom says they 'perceive' (αἰσθάνεσθαι), an interpretation found in previous patristic authors.⁸² This enables Chrysostom to reflect at length on the rational capacity of Adam and Eve, their ability to discern between good and evil, and their ability to choose the former.

Another notable case emerges from what Amirav has called Chrysostom's reading of 'metaphorical humanity',⁸³ developed in several *Homilies on Genesis*. At one point, Scripture has the 'habit' of designating a human being with the word 'soul,' and on the other hand, with the word 'body'.⁸⁴ The comparative

79 Harl in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *La Bible grecque*, 239.

80 Diodore, *Comm. in Ps.* 16,2b, l.20–21 (CCSG 6.85): *Οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου ἰδέτωσαν εὐθύτητας. Καὶ ὡς ἔθος, φησὶν, ἔχεις δικαίῳ ὀφθαλμῷ κρίνειν τὰ πράγματα, οὕτω καὶ νῦν.*

81 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 16.5 (PG 53.131).

82 Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 3.23.5 (SC 34.190,7–15); see Harl, *La Genèse*, 107 for other interpretations, such as the awakening of sexual desire or the realization of the needs of practical life.

83 Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 169.

84 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 65.3 (PG 54.562; FOC 87.249–250); Asensio, 'El Crisóstomo', 254, esp. n. 75 notes several occurrences of this theme throughout the *Homilies on Genesis*. Chase, *Chrysostom*, 111–113 anticipates, suggesting that Chrysostom's lexical changes regarding anthropological terms like soul, spirit, and flesh may resemble those of other authors like Origen and Theodore.

‘just as’ (καθάπερ) places in parallel Gen 47,11–12 and 46,26–27 as evidence for this claim. Yet uses of ‘human beings’ (ἄνθρωποι) in Scripture can function in the opposite direction, too, which is the direction he takes in regard to Noah and the flood. Amirav found that in *Homily 22 on Genesis*, when Chrysostom asserts that Scripture ‘always’ refers to ‘flesh’ (Gen 6,3) or fleshly matters in a moral sense, he is engaging an Alexandrian exegetical tradition that sought to make fine distinctions among souls, showing some—in this case of Noah’s contemporaries—to be worthy of severe punishment, a solution to the Antiochene concern to establish God as sufficiently caring towards mankind.⁸⁵ Just as ‘Alexandrians’ like Eusebius of Caesarea, Didymus, and Origen referenced multiple biblical texts to establish this habit of a hierarchy of souls, so too Chrysostom plied this notion for his purposes of defending God’s philanthropic motivations. Similar to the methodology of Origen, it was the recurrence of the same term in different biblical texts which enabled Chrysostom to make such conceptual leaps. Over the course of two homilies, to show that the word ‘humans’ means those taken up with fleshly or earthly thoughts, Genesis texts are compared with the prophets and Paul and the ‘habit’ (ἔθος) is discovered.⁸⁶ Gen 6,3 contrasts the divine ‘spirit’ with the widespread indolence of pre-deluge humanity, about which it is said that ‘they are flesh [σάρκας]’. Again, using καθάπερ to compare, Rom 8,9 clarifies this ‘habit,’ when the apostle says that ‘you are not in the flesh [σαρκί]’, implying that the divine life is spiritual in contradistinction.⁸⁷ From here, Chrysostom makes the startling argument that the ‘humans’ of Noah’s generation are not actually ‘worthy of the name human being’ (ἀνθρώπου προσηγορίας ἄξιον). These have metaphorically disassociated themselves with what the bible understands as the rational character of human righteousness exemplified by Noah.⁸⁸ Chrysostom thereby deduces that ‘human beings’ are those people on whom the spirit of God remains, whose thoughts rise above this fleshly state.

Chrysostom dialogues with patristic exegetical traditions on the basis of this semantic glossing and explanation of Scriptural ‘habit’. He modifies, it seems, Antiochene concerns by introducing Alexandrian word-studies. Commenting on Gen 6,3 and Romans 8,9 as well, Didymus makes the exact same connections between human being, flesh, and the virtuous condition of humanity on whom

85 Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 97–106.

86 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 23.4 (PG 53.201–202), where he refers to ‘yesterday’s teaching’, which is found in 22.3 (PG 53.190) in which the same ‘habit’ (ἔθος) regarding ‘flesh’ (σάρκα) and ‘those called fleshly’ (τοὺς σαρκικοὺς καλεῖν) is discussed.

87 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 22.3 (PG 53.190); Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 95.

88 Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 170.

the spirit of God remains, enabling them to advance beyond fleshly thoughts.⁸⁹ Antiochenes had codified some of these glossular meanings. Adrian's *Introduction* testifies to a four-fold distinction regarding the biblical senses of the term flesh. One uses Gen 6,3 towards similar effect as Chrysostom, but Theodore and Diodore do not follow Didymus's and Chrysostom's non-literal expositions.⁹⁰

2.2 Grammatical Features

While it is difficult to discern any overarching logic as to which nouns and adverbs attracted the attention of a 'habit' explanation, grammatical peculiarities are more evidently relevant to the style of linguistic commentary adapted from pagan critics. Chase has already loosely catalogued some of Chrysostom's grammatical discussions, but his analysis may be extended to a systematic study of the envisaged complete *Homilies on Genesis*, which will give the reader an impression of how extensive this practice was for Chrysostom and how his comments compared to other exegetes.⁹¹ The *Genesis* homilies bring up four grammatical issues, namely word doubling, temporal particles, personal pronouns, and plurals.

2.2.1 *Diplasiasmos*

Chrysostom occasionally mentions the phenomenon of word doubling, or what he calls διπλασιασμός. In some scholia, we find several mentions of syllable or letter doubling in regard to the identification of a particular dialect, such as when the Homeric text uses ὀπότερος for ὅπότερος, this π-doubling is a feature of Aeolic.⁹² John Chrysostom was not interested in distinguishing Greek dialects for his audience; the Septuagint, with its Hebrew *Vorlage*, offer doublets for an entirely different reason. In his *Homilies on Genesis* Chrysostom

89 Didymus, *In Gen.* 153 (SC 244.26); see full discussion and comparison with Chrysostom in Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 101–103.

90 Adrian, *Intr.* 57.1–4, esp. 57.2 (MARTENS, 211) where 'flesh' denotes badness (φαυλότητος); cf. *Cat. frag.* 36 (MARTENS, 313), Theodore, *Cat. Gal. ad 5,15* (CGPNT 6.80–81) and Diodore, *Comm. in Ps. ad 36,1*, l.15–16 (CCSG 6.215).

91 Chase, *Chrysostom*, 93–104, on the article, the genitive, some conjunctions, and preposition; 98 where ἵνα always denotes result, which Chase argues enables Chrysostom to uphold 'Antiochene theology': God is good; man is free; ontological distinctions enable the good to prosper.

92 *Schol. d in Il. Ad 3,71* (VAN THIEL, 155): ὀπότερος δέ κε: ὁποῖς δὲ ἄν' ὁ τρόπος διπλασιασμός, ἢ διάλεκτος Αἰλῖς. Cf. *ad 18,15* (ibid., 442): ἤριπτο, καὶ Ἀττικὸς ἀναδιπλασιασμός ἐρήριπτο, καὶ κατὰ συστολὴν ἐρέριπτο. Scholiasts on other works see the phenomenon less as a grammatical issue and more as a literary feature, such as those on Aristophanes; see W.G. Rutherford, *A Chapter in the History of Annotation, being Scholia Aristophanica* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1905), III:269.

points out four separate cases.⁹³ Some, such as the repetition of the formula declaring Mathousala's virtue, are results of the translation from the Hebrew.⁹⁴ Others, however, are unique to the style of the Septuagint and concern the repetitions of names or adverbs to clarify or emphasize different aspects of the narrative. The doubling of 'exceedingly' (σφόδρα) modifies God's multiplication of Abraham's descendants and the material blessings of Jacob.⁹⁵ The doubling is added 'not simply' (οὐχ ἀπλῶς) but 'it wishes' (βούλεται) to create the impression of massive scale, says Chrysostom. The use of questions and identification terminology in these cases is indicative of a scholastic context. The name of Abraham itself is also doubled throughout the Greek text of Genesis. Chrysostom takes this to be a matter of divine regard for Abraham. His teachings on word doubling in the *Homilies on Genesis* do not, thereby, extend beyond the statement of excess or emphasis on God's providential care, as seems to be the case for mentions of *diplasiaismos* in Chrysostom's other works such as *On Providence*.⁹⁶ The reserved use of this grammatical term was current among other Antiochene exegetes. In Adrian and Theodore, *diplasiaismos* is customarily (συνήθως) used to invoke the sense of a command.⁹⁷ Eusebius of Emesa had already raised similar points. For him (mistakenly),⁹⁸ it is a special 'custom' (ῥῆμα) of the Hebrews to repeat verbal expressions in participial form, such as 'living, you shall live',⁹⁹ and Diodore was similarly concerned about tautology.¹⁰⁰

93 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 21.4 (PG 53.180); 39.3 (53.365); 47.1–2 (54.429–431); 57.2 (54.496).

94 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 21.4 (PG 53.180).

95 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 39.3 (PG 53.365); same explanation in 47.1 (PG 54.429).

96 It is this way too in the *Expositions on the Psalms* (PG 55) where the phenomenon is noted seven times, but the lack of certainty regarding this work's authenticity calls for a cautious use of it for our present purposes. See e.g. *Exp. in Ps. CXXVI* 1 (PG 55.361), where διπλασιασμός of starting two succeeding lines with 'enlarge' (ἐμεγάλυνε) is added 'not simply' (οὐχ ἀπλῶς). In *Ad eos qui scand.* 10.18 (SC 79.160–161), he does not mention here a principle of 'habit', but discusses the *diplasiaismos* of Abraham's names, as above.

97 Theodore, *Comm. in Ps. ad* 74.2a (ST 93.500,6–7), when the Psalmist repeats 'let us praise,' it is the emphasis (τὴν ἐπίτασιν) on 'thanksgiving.' Adrian, *Intr.* 70 (MARTENS, 228,1–3), 'Waiting, I waited on the Lord,' which is a matter for 'emphasis' (ἐπίτασιν), citing texts from the Pentateuch and Psalms. Devreesse, *Essai*, 59 sets this against the backdrop of Theodore's attempt to explain the concision of the Hebrew.

98 These Septuagint expressions are simply translations of the Hebrew paronomastic absolute infinitive: H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament Greek According to the Septuagint* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 47–50; ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 371.

99 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 113 (TEG 15.152).

100 Mariès, *Études*, 119; cf. L. Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary*

2.2.2 'Until'

Another grammatical feature Chrysostom could discuss was an issue brought up through the Septuagint's use of the temporal particle 'until' (ἕως). Normally, we would expect this to denote in part the end of one action. When the text of Gen 8,7 reads that the crow sent out by Noah 'did not return until the water had dried up from the earth', the implication would be that the crow, in fact, later returned to the ark after the water had dissipated. But as the narrative continues, this is evidently not the case; Chrysostom had to find a way to explain why the crow never returned. It is a 'peculiarity' (ἰδίωμα) of the Scriptures, he says, because it is not the case that the bird returned 'after these things'.¹⁰¹ He reprises this exact discussion in *Homily 5 on Matthew*. In the first chapter of this gospel, it is stated that Joseph did not know his wife, Mary, 'until' (ἕως) she had given birth to Jesus. Our preacher hastens to add that the use of 'until' here does not imply that this state of celibacy continued. He explains the principle more clearly here. It is a 'habit' (ἔθος) of scripture to use this word 'not to reference limited [διωρισμένων] times',¹⁰² that is, a cessation. Gen 8,7 comes to his aid as proof, as do two Psalm texts. The same principle is at work in Theodore, who says that 'until' is not spoken 'definitively' (ὀριστικῶς), as in 'to that point and no longer'; he believes that it habitually speaks in the opposite way.¹⁰³ Diodore shows that a common source (perhaps himself) likely animated all three authors on this point. In a comment on Ps 70,18, 'until' is 'not used as a limitation [περιορισμόν]'.¹⁰⁴ Adrian's handbook codifies the idea: 'Often Scripture does not use the word 'until' with regard to a period of time, but with regard to the continuation of the same activity'.¹⁰⁵ Because of the theological importance gathered around this word, it seems that Chrysostom adapts a well-worn tradition in

Study, trans. D.E. Orton–R.D. Anderson (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 608–624 for similar principles in the rhetoricians.

101 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 26.4 (PG 53.234; FOC 82.153); Chase, Chrysostom, 98.

102 John Chrysostom, *In Matt. hom.* 5 (HM 1:64–65). See J.T. Lienhard, 'The Exegesis of 1 Cor 15, 24–28 from Marcellus of Ancyra to Theodoret of Cyrus', VC 37.4 (1983), 343 who shows that Eusebius of Caesarea offered the same explanation of this temporal particle regarding some Gospel passages in refutation of Marcellus's position that Christ's kingdom will come to an end.

103 Theodore, *Comm. in Ps. ad* 56,2 (ST 93.369.15–18).

104 Mariès, *Études*, 107.

105 Adrian, *Intr.* 60 (MARTENS, 214). Reference to Theodore's proof text of Ps 56,2 and Chrysostom's proof text of Mt 1,25 occur in Adrian's citations. Martens notes that it is also witnessed in Theodoret and Isidore of Pelusium.

his works. In the *Homilies on Genesis* it functions to resolve a potential contradiction, and in another case the more important issue of Mary's virginity is defended.

2.2.3 Personal Pronouns

In the *Homilies on Genesis*, Chrysostom also considers as a habit how scripture applies personal pronouns.¹⁰⁶ When God declares that 'I am your God' (Gen 17,2), Chrysostom admits that this appears to restrict God's dominion to Abraham. The grammatical problem is therefore entirely theological. It reminds Chrysostom of another text where this is the case, Ex 3,6, where the divine tells Moses that 'I am the God of Abraham'. Looking at the pronoun your (σου), Chrysostom says that the term is not 'restricted to him' (οὐ περικλείοντες αὐτοῦ), that is, the pronoun does not mean that God is the God of Abraham alone.¹⁰⁷ To support this notion, he says that the 'prophets are habituated [εἰώθασι] to say this', and then gives a generic refrain from the psalms, 'O God, *My* God' (emphasis added). In the end, the pronoun signifies 'the boundless desire' (τὸν πόθον ἀκάθεκτον) of the divine for Abraham. This same expression about the divine 'boundless desire' is used in his full-length treatment of the pronoun conundrum in the homiletic *Exposition on Psalm 113*.¹⁰⁸ Similarly, elsewhere in his work we find treated the scriptural 'habit' (ἔθος) of the 'restriction' (συγκλείοντες) of divine pronouns to certain spheres. The 'God of this world or of heaven or my God', Chrysostom observes, 'You will find many other witnesses [μαρτυρίας]' in the Scriptures.¹⁰⁹ Harkening back to his emphasis on the universalism of the gospel, Chrysostom wants to convey that the Christian God is not the god of particular men only, such as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (οὐκ ἐκεῖνων μόνον ἐστὶ Θεός). Philo, Origen, and Gregory of Nyssa have similar reflections on the question of how to take the sense of restrictive pronouns in these and related biblical texts. Philo, for instance, uses the same expression 'boundless desire' to resolve the problem.¹¹⁰ Notably, however, Philo applied it to Abra-

106 E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889), 17 overviews Septuagint paraphrase translations of Hebrew personal pronouns.

107 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 39.2 (PG 53.363; FOC 82.378).

108 Ibid., *Ex. in Ps. CXIII* 6 (PG 55.313).

109 John Chrysostom, *In ep. ii ad Cor. hom.* 8 (EP 3.101).

110 Philo, *Migr.* 132 (PAO 2.294,4), in which the expression 'Fear the Lord thy (σου) God' (Dt 10,20) is an excitement of 'boundless desire' (τὸν πόθον ἀκάθεκτον) in Abraham. Chrysostom uses this locution elsewhere, e.g. in *De virg.* 30.2 (SC 125.190,29) and *In faciem et restiti* 6 (PG 51.377); compare Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 13.106–107 (GCS 10.242) and *Cat.* 879 (TEG 3.6), wherein Origen explains the relationship between Jews and Gentiles based on the expression 'I am your God' (Gen 12,1–2; Gen 17,2). In Gregory of Nyssa, *C. Eun.* 2.87 (GNO

ham, whereas Chrysostom to God himself. Old Testament pronoun-problem texts thereby attracted into their webs a pattern of reference and expression, suggesting a closely shared pool of resources between Chrysostom and these Alexandrian authors. In Diodore's *Commentary on the Psalms* the general issue is known but treated differently. It is a habit, he remarks, to replace 'God with yours' (θεοῦ ἀντὶ τοῦ σου), which makes sense of the poetic parallelism 'Your righteousness is as the mountains of God'.¹¹¹ From this vantage point, Chrysostom's grammatical-apologetic tradition shares more in common with Alexandrians than his Antiochene mentor, the former proving the more accessible resource to address the universal message of the gospel to a mass-audience.

2.2.4 Singular and Plural

The issue of Septuagint plural expressions raises a discussion in *Homily 4 on Genesis* concerning the Hebrew idioms in the Greek texts of Genesis and the Psalms, a passage already visited for its signaling Chrysostom's explicit awareness and use of translation problems in his Antiochene works. The problem was ultimately about Scriptural contradiction and speculation, for sometimes 'heaven' is used, at others, 'heavens'. Further, Gen 1,1 and Gen 1,8 seem to suggest the creation of two separate heaven. Are there 'many heavens' (πολλοὺς οὐρανοὺς) created, or are these multiplicities an elaboration of the same heaven? Part of Chrysostom's answer appeals to the idiom of the biblical text as a translation. After narrating the providential translation of the Septuagint, Chrysostom says that it is a feature (σύνηθες) of the Hebrew language to speak of a singular (ένος) by using a plural construction (πληθυντικῶς).¹¹² While the discussion of this exegetical problems is abundant,¹¹³ Chrysostom's formulation and

1.252,14–16), the reflection is developed in a sense closer to that of Chrysostom: 'the Lord of all creation, having become a kind of discovery of the patriarch, is called in a sense Abraham's own God' (ὁ πάσης κρίσεως κύριος, ὥσπερ τι εὔρημα τοῦ πατριάρχου γενόμενος, ἰδίως Θεὸς τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ὀνομάζεται). Gregory's use of ἰδίως Θεὸς parallels the sense of περι-κλείοντες used in Chrysostom. Like Chrysostom, Ex 3,6 is his prooftext.

111 Diodore, *Comm. in Ps.* 35,7, l.55–57 (CSG 6.211); see the similar comment regarding *apostrophe* or reversal of persons: 'To you ... to my God I cry' in 29,9, l.77–80 (*ibid.*, 168).

112 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 4.3 (PG 53.43): ἄλλ' ἐπειδὴ σύνηθες τῇ γλώττῃ τῶν Ἑβραίων οὕτως ὀνομάζειν τοῦ τὴν ἑνὸς προσηγορίαν πληθυντικῶς.

113 Elaboration of the debates in third- and fourth-century biblical exegetes may be found in S.A. Pomeroy, 'Numbering the Heaven(s): John Chrysostom's Use of Greek Exegetical Traditions for Interpreting Gen 1,6–8 (*Hom. Gen.* IV)', *ETL* 92.2 (2016), 203–228, Alexandre, *Le commencement*, 102–106; J. Pépin, 'Recherches sur le sens et les origines de l'expression caelum caeli dans le livre XII des Confessions de s. Augustin', *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 23 (1953), 185–274; the Septuagint 'heaven of the heavens' is discussed in Hatch, *Essays*, 266–267. Good examples are Eusebius of Caesarea, *Comm. Ps. ad* 18,2 (PG 23.188–

reference to a feature of the Hebrew parallels closely that of early Antiochene exegetes such as Eustathius and Diodore on the same problem. Respectively, they raise the question of whether there are ‘many heavens’ (πολλοὺς οὐρανοὺς), and reference David speaking of the heavens by ‘the singular as plural’ (τὸ ἓνα ὡς πληθυντικῶς), to which Scripture is accustomed (εἰωθεν) because of the Hebrew ‘idiom’—the same expressions found in Chrysostom’s *Homily 4 on Genesis*.¹¹⁴

Chrysostom also explained this principle, without reference to the Hebrew, in the context of trinitarian theology elsewhere in his works. Read stringently, the text of Acts 5,23–25 seems to suggest that the Holy Spirit inheres only in the Father. But another, Mt 12,28, seems to suggest that the Spirit inheres only in the Son. This is because scripture has the ‘habit to speak about the one [ἐνός] as if it were many [πολλῶν]’,¹¹⁵ Basil of Caesarea similarly deployed the language of scriptural habit to explain trinitarian semantics.¹¹⁶ Further, at several points in Gen 2, the Septuagint syntax, which often mimicked that of the Hebrew, is strained around the rendering of the tetragrammaton and Elohim appearing side-by-side, such as in ‘Lord the God’ (κύριος ὁ θεός) (e.g. Gen 2,17, cf. Ps 83,12).¹¹⁷ Three times throughout *Homilies 14 and 15 on Genesis* he mentions that the text ‘here used the same feature’ (ἐνταῦθα τῇ αὐτῇ συνηθείᾳ ἐχρήσατο) for expressing the divine name,¹¹⁸ but there are some heretics who raise the problem of plurality. According to Chrysostom, there are some people who think that the biblical expression κύριος ὁ θεός permits a ‘dividing’ (ἀποκληροῦν) of the divine nature into Father and Son. But this is not so. It is possible ‘to assign’ (προσνέμειν) the names, but they are ‘indistinguishable’ (ἀδιαφόρως), ‘both belong to one nature’.¹¹⁹ To study these expressions elsewhere in the bible, he uses comparative words like ‘just as’ (ὥσπερ), ‘frequently’ (πολλάκις), and ‘again’ (πάλιν). The Eunomian controversies are clearly the context for these grammatically-based theological discussions. Harkening to a common polemical trope, in *Homily 15 on Genesis*, he rejects the opinion that ‘the origin of the creator has been comprehended’ through such double naming.¹²⁰ Some of these explanations were

189) and Adrian, *Intr.* 37 (MARTENS, 178), which uses the same terms as Chrysostom: ‘plural’ (πληθυντικῶς) ‘idiom’ (ἰδιῶμα) ‘singular’ (ἐνικόν).

114 Diodore, *Comm. in Ps.* 18,2b, L43–47 (CCSG 6.110); Eustathius of Antioch, *C. Ar., Frag.* 34, 36 (CCSG 51.106–108).

115 John Chrysostom, *In Acta apost. Hom.* 11.2 (PG 60.95).

116 Basil of Caesarea, *Eun.* 1.10.1–7 (SC 299.204), discussing ἐν and ποικίλα; Bartelink, ‘Observations’, 99.

117 Gauthier, ‘The “Pluses”’, 54–58.

118 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 14.3 (PG 53.114; FOC 74.186); × 2 in 15.2 (53.121; FOC 74.199).

119 Ibid. (FOC 74.186).

120 Ibid., 15.2 (PG 53.121; FOC 74.199).

learned. Gregory of Nyssa, for instance, asserts that this same duplicate divine name formula addressed by Chrysostom indicates ‘not distinct natures’ (μὴ διάφορους φύσεις) even though it is said ‘by a plural expression’ (ἐν τῇ πληθυντικῇ σημασίᾳ).¹²¹ Chrysostom thereby introduces theological strategies with developed text-webs for his pro-Nicene theology into the *Homilies on Genesis*.

2.3 Literary Features

Exegetes in antiquity viewed the identification of tropes as another essential tool for rhetorical criticism, and by the fourth- and fifth-centuries, Christians had a number of developed traditions for doing similarly.¹²² In the *Homilies on Genesis*, Chrysostom notes four according to the habit of scripture: summary, metaphor, synecdoche, metonymy. These occur occasionally elsewhere in his *oeuvre* and parallel discussions in other early Christian biblical exegetes.

2.3.1 Summary

For the ancient reader unaware of the modern documentary hypothesis which posits two different sources for the creation accounts of Gen 1–2, the text of Gen 2,4 was rather awkward.¹²³ Like a title, it announced ‘the book of the generation of heaven and earth’, appearing redundant in face of the opening lines of the book of Genesis, which read that ‘In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth’. Chrysostom finds it ‘worth inquiring here’ (ἄξιον ἐνταῦθα ζητῆσαι), and as Hidal identified, references the ‘sequence’ of the texts as containing the answer.¹²⁴ The answer is that Gen 2,4 ‘is summarizing’ (ἀνακεφαλαιούμεως), which is the ‘habit’ (ἔθος) of Scripture ‘not to describe everything to us

121 Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Ablab.*, GNO 3/1.55,3. For further discussions of the duplicate divine name, see *Eun.* 1.396 (GNO 1.143,73), where the names of Father and Son do not imply ‘the distinction according to natures’ (τὴν κατὰ τὰς οὐσίας διαφοράν); cf. 1.548 (*ibid.*, 185); 1.620 (*ibid.*, 205,11–12); compare further John Chrysostom, *In Ep. ii ad Tim. hom.* 3 (EP 6.186d) where ‘Marcion’ would suggest that this naming means that ‘two natures are divided’ (δύο οὐσίας διαφερούσας) rather than a signification of their ‘blending’ (ὁμοουσίων), for which ‘it is necessary to learn’ (μανθανέτωσαν) the ‘habit’ (ἔθος). Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, 345–359 provides an accessible overview of Gregory’s theology in the context of the debates with Eunomius.

122 A list and discussion of τρόποι in the Greek bible is given in Adrian, *Intr.* 73.1–22 (MARTENS, 233–269); Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.6.1 provides accessible discussion of literary tropes in antiquity.

123 Harl, *La Genèse*, 99–100, explains that the natural conclusion to the creation narrative would have been Gen 5,1, which announces the start to ‘the generation of men’ (αὕτη ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως ἀνθρώπων). Origen, *C. Cels.* 6.49 (SVC 54.427,17–25), for instance, took it this way.

124 Hidal, ‘Exegesis in the Antiochene School’, 560.

in detail in every case but rather to begin with related items and leave further details to be considered'.¹²⁵ The awkward seeming book-title thereby appears as a summary of all things that have been created previously in Gen 1. What Chrysostom here calls 'summary' was discussed likewise by other Antiochenes: Eusebius of Emesa, Theodore, Theodoret, and Adrian, all mention Gen 2,4 from the perspective of 'summary' (ἀνακεφαλαίωσις) or 'repetition' (ἐπληρηρητής).¹²⁶ Such a wide attestation suggests that the text was controversial. This impression is confirmed by Chrysostom's application of a range of discourse markers, such as 'do you see', 'do not be surprised, beloved', 'he has taught us'. Further, Chrysostom suggests that the Holy Spirit authored the summary of Gen 2,4 in this way so as to ward off future 'contention' (φιλονικεῖν) set 'against the dogmas of the Church'.¹²⁷ We lack a clear conception of Chrysostom's envisaged opponent. But Celsus had mocked the creation account as 'absurd' (ἄτοπος) due to its illogical treatment of time and sequence, such as creating the 'day' apparently before there was sun, moon, and stars.¹²⁸ At least some pagan criticism, then, had been raised against the sequence of texts like Gen 2,4. What is clear, though, is that Chrysostom wished to use an established literary-exegetical tradition to provide his audience a chance to defend the Genesis text as offering a reliable account of creation, attesting to divine providence and written in a way that the simplest could understand.

Elsewhere Chrysostom commented on summary, such as when the word itself is used in Rom 13,9. Here 'Love your neighbor' becomes 'the whole in brief' (ἐν βραχεὶ τὸ πᾶν), posing 'concisely' (συντόμως) a single commandment of all divine virtue.¹²⁹ As in the case of plural and other grammatical features, the theological utility of summary becomes clear. In a homily addressing Eunomius and his followers, he finds that the texts of Gen 2,4 and Ezk 1,28 are written in a parallel way: 'this is the book' (αὕτη ἡ βίβλος), and 'this is the vision' (αὕτη ἡ

125 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 12.1 (PG 53.99; FOC 74.158, mod.).

126 Theodore, *Cat.* 190 (TEG 1.132), tentatively confirmed by *Diyaṛ. Comm. ad Gen* 2,4 (CSCO 483.23,12–14): 'What is this ["in the beginning"]? He wants to clarify what precedes by this repetition' (ⲁⲓⲙⲁⲗ ⲛⲥⲟ ⲛⲉⲃⲱⲧⲓⲁⲗ ⲛⲥⲟ ⲛⲓ ⲛⲱⲧⲓ ⲁⲙ ⲛⲁⲃⲱⲧⲓ); Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 10b (TEG 15.44); Adrian, *Intr.* 73.9 (MARTENS, 244,1), where 'summary' (ἀνακεφαλαίωσιν, ἐπανάληφιν) is 'whenever it goes through again with a few words' (ὅταν τὰ διὰ πλείονων ποικίλως ἐισηγηθέντα), with Gen 2,4 and others as proof; Theodoret, *Q. Gen.* 22,3 (LEC 1.58): ἐν κεφαλαίῳ. See Ernesti, *Lexicon*, 1:19 for definitions given by ancient rhetoricians.

127 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 12.1 (PG 53.100; FOC 74.159).

128 Origen, *C. Cels.* 6.60 (SVC 52.437,10–20); Cook, *Interpretation*, 66–67.

129 John Chrysostom, *In ep. ad Rom. hom.* 24 (EP 1.388c); cf. *In ep. ad Eph. hom.* 1 (EP 4.114d): summary (ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι) is glossed 'join together' (συνάψαι), which is understood as a feature (συνηθεία).

ὄρασις), respectively. In regard to Ezk 1,28, the term ‘this’ enables Chrysostom to find here a point on which ‘I summarize’ (ἀνακεφαλαιοῦμαι), capturing the various images such as throne and rainbow that render the divine reality according to human limitations.¹³⁰

2.3.2 Metaphor

In the *Homilies on Genesis*, Chrysostom distinguished metaphor as a habitual literary trope. Commenting on the ‘Lion of Judah’ poeticized in Gen 49,9, he says that this image tells of ‘royal authority’ (βασιλικὴν αὐθεντίαν). This is so according to ‘a constant habit’ (ἔθος αἰεὶ), where Scripture ‘refers [αἰνίττεσθαι] by the image [εἰκόνας] of this creature.’¹³¹ Here the ruling properties of a lion are transferred to Judah, which is in turn an image ‘foretelling’ the kingdom of Christ.¹³² This particular mention of the iconic quality of the text is one technique within his lengthy exposition of the Gen 49 blessing, of which he says that the whole thing may ‘singularly’ (ἁπαξᾶπλῶς) be taken as ‘somewhat mystical [μυστικὴ τις], foretelling [προμηνύουσα] to us all the things relating to the Christ.’¹³³ Chrysostom thereby disagreed with his predecessors Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore who had restricted Christological referents to only a few texts in the pericope, and drew instead upon the exposition of Gen 49 in Eusebius of Caesarea.¹³⁴ It is not that the Emesene and Diodore were unaware of such referents: they denied explicitly what Chrysostom and the Caesarean affirm. Using the same images and key terms as the Caesarean to establish his systematic iconic exegesis of this text, Chrysostom builds an entire homily out of the connection between prophetic and metaphorical registers.

Indeed, *Homily 67 on Genesis* is dotted with anticipatory references based on and surrounding the narrative images of the blessing text. For instance, in the earlier portion of Gen 49,4, Joseph mentions that Rouben’s headstrong ways lead him into inappropriate relations with his father. Joseph’s calling him to account is ‘anticipating’ (προλαβὼν) the Mosaic prohibitions to incest.¹³⁵ Stacking up anticipatory readings based on metaphor had a wider purpose in the discourse. Chrysostom carefully placed Joseph’s historical context into cognitive dissonance with what he expected of his audience.¹³⁶ Joseph’s prophetic

130 John Chrysostom, *C. Anom.* 4,83 (SC 28^{bis}.234).

131 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 67.2 (PG 54.574; FOC 87.269).

132 In Diodore, *Coisl.* 299 (CCSG 15) and Adrian, *Intr.* 38 (MARTENS, 180,1,9), the ‘Lion of Judah’ is a comparison (παραβάλλει).

133 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 67.2 (PG 54.574; FOC 87.269, mod.).

134 Details in Chapter 7.

135 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 67.2 (PG 54.573; FOC 87.268).

136 Cf. Stenger, ‘Text Worlds’, 229–230.

eyes also stretch to other aspects of his and Israel's future, such as the imminent enslavement of his kin in Egypt and the death of his father, introduced in Gen 50. Chrysostom wished to create the impression that the final words of Genesis were a guarantee that those who endure suffering will be joined to the reigning kingdom of Christ. Suffering is itself an anticipation, just as Joseph's blessing provided images of the salvific economy of Christ.

When Joseph's father at last dies, Gen 50,10–11 depicts him grieving heavily. Chrysostom profiles this scene through the lens of 'our' values, creating a dramatic parallel between what Joseph experienced as death prior to the salvific economy of Christ and what 'we' experience as death now that we have redemption. For despite the anticipatory mode of his previous speech, Joseph's suffering was not keyed into the reality which he foresaw, namely the redemption in Christ in which 'death is called [λεγόμενος] sleep'.¹³⁷ This theme, which Druet refers to as Chrysostom's conception of the 'changement historique du nom pour la mort' recalls the earlier treatment in *Homily 29 on Genesis*.¹³⁸ There, Cham's descendants are found to live under the curse of slavery. But knowing what we do, slavery both to sin and men is only a material condition with a name. It does not preclude our ability to choose virtue—just like death is 'only a name'.¹³⁹ Chrysostom thus makes his audience a witness to a 'former' mode of grief, which he accomplishes with a series of contrasting temporal particles, 'not yet' (οὐδέπω ×3) and 'now' (νῦν). With this in place, he can turn the table of comprehension, causing his audience to reassess their experience of death. He does this by preserving the parallel between his audience and Joseph. Despite being unaware of Christ's cosmic redemption, Joseph is still rewarded in a salutary way, for after forgiving his brothers for enslaving him, he is handed the keys of the kingdom of Egypt. Chrysostom then states the *hypothesis*: 'the one who has suffered reigns' (πεπονθώς βασιλεύει), for as Paul insinuates in Rom 8,28, 'all things,' which Chrysostom glosses with even 'those opposing thing' (τὰ ἐναντία) like death work for the good of those in the fellowship of God and enacting works of forgiveness like Joseph.¹⁴⁰ Joseph's whole movement from prophetic blessing to grief is thereby given what Young called 'a sense of recapitulation', being impressed with the narrative structure of Christian suffering.¹⁴¹ The blessing and response to death are correlated with

137 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 67.4 (PG 54.577).

138 F.-X. Druet, *Langage, images et visages de la mort chez Jean Chrysostome*, CÉT 3 (Namur: Presses Universitaires Namur, 1990), 100.

139 *Ibid.*, 29.7 (PG 53.270; FOC 82.214), discussed in Chapter 3.

140 *Ibid.*, 67.5 (PG 54.578).

141 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 152.

the events of his own life in a way that makes him a metaphor for the Christian condition, suffering under virtue in this present life for the sake of the coming reign, already felt by what Chrysostom viewed as death's diminished effects. The arrival at this conception is accomplished through a complex reassessment process in which Chrysostom telescopes between Joseph's context and 'ours', a stretching warranted by the prophetic and metaphorical tone of the Gen 49 pericope.

How Chrysostom and other Antiochene treat metaphor elsewhere illuminates the significance of the above assessment of *Homily 67 on Genesis*. The 'king' of the Assyrians mentioned in Isa 8,7–8 is described as possessing the qualities of a river. Chrysostom comments, 'Scripture has the constant habit of interpreting [ἐαυτὴν ἐρμηνεύειν εἴωθεν] its own metaphors [μεταφοραῖς] ... Speaking of a river, it does not remain at the level of metaphor ... but shows that it is not a human force doing these things, but [they are done] through the divine wrath'.¹⁴² This passage should remind us of the famous text earlier in the *Isaiah 6* series where Chrysostom announces that Scripture itself gives the contextual justification for providing non-literal interpretation, and never the caprice of the interpreter.¹⁴³ Here it shows the kings in the throes of a natural object like a river, clearly referring to divine action. Theodore and Adrian witness similar discussions of metaphor, which Adrian defines as the transfer of the properties of one thing to another which could be applied to either us or God.¹⁴⁴ Theodore views the flooding 'sea' (Am 9,2) as Assyrian throng pouring out over the land of Israel, that is, conquering it.¹⁴⁵ These discussions of contextual literary tropes and Chrysostom's theory of non-literal interpretation in the *Isaiah 6* series contrast with the example of *Homily 67 on Genesis*. For in the *Genesis* homily, Chrysostom's liberal application of iconic exegesis to many texts throughout Gen 49–50 is motivated not by the hermeneutical theory espoused in the *Isaiah 6* work, but by the opportunity corroborated from previous exegetical models and the contextual need to bridge the world of his audience with the world of Joseph by posing a continuous history in which his audience may reassess the past through the knowledge of his teaching about Christ's redemption.

142 John Chrysostom, *Comm. Isa.* 8,3,1–13 (SC 304,351–352).

143 Ibid., *Comm. Isa.* 5,3 (SC 304,222); Chapter 1, n. 17.

144 Adrian, *Intr.* 73,1 (MARTENS, 234,10–13).

145 Theodore, *Comm. in Am. Ad* 9,6 (GO 5/1.152,16–21); for metaphor in Diodore, see Mariès, *Études*, 118.

2.3.3 Synecdoche and Metonymy

To identify synecdoche, Chrysostom addresses an apparent contradiction regarding the fulfillment of one of Joseph's dreams. At one point Joseph dreamt that his parents and siblings would bow down to him (Gen 37,10). But when the sunset years of his father Jacob approach (Gen 47,29–31), his parents have yet to do so. More problematic, his mother is dead. How could she bow down to him, then? It is resolved in the fact that his father, Jacob, is there, and indeed bows to his son. Through Jacob's father, his mother also can bow to him as the dream foretold. In *Homily 66 on Genesis*, Chrysostom cites a working definition of a synecdoche to justify this move: 'It is invariably Scripture's habit [ἔθος αἰεὶ] to offer the explanation of the whole from the principle example' [ἀπὸ τοῦ κυριωτέρου τὸ πᾶν δηλοῦν].¹⁴⁶ He thereby argues that the 'principle example' in this case is Joseph's father, Jacob. Polidoulis Kapsalis described Chrysostom's understanding of the 'image' shared by men and women as having been 'amputated' at the fall. In *Homily 8 on Genesis*, Chrysostom includes women as sharing in the image of God insofar as she is subordinated to her husband, the 'head' (cf. 1 Cor 11,3 and Gen 2,24).¹⁴⁷ This understanding is operative here in *Homily 66 on Genesis*. Even though absent, Jacob's mother bowed to him insofar as she was present with her husband, through subordination, her husband being the 'principle example' of their union.

Theodore and Adrian defined synecdoche similarly. While they referenced different biblical texts, Adrian's formulation closely resembles Chrysostom's own: 'it indicates the whole from its part' (ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ ὅλον δηλοῖ).¹⁴⁸ It seems, then, that Chrysostom applied a known scholastic definition to explain the passage. However, the matter is slightly more complicated than that.

Chrysostom's raising the problem of Gen 37,10 and Gen 47,29–31 is a subtle departure from Antiochene exegetical traditions. Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore had identified an obscurity here, namely the matter of to whom Jacob bowed.¹⁴⁹ This is not the same thing as Chrysostom's viewing of a potential contradiction and failure of prophetic fulfillment. Further, while his predecessors

146 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 66.2 (PG 54,567; FOC 87,258).

147 M.-F. Polidoulis Kapsalis, *Image as Authority in the Writings of John Chrysostom*, Ph.D diss., University of St Michael's College (University of Toronto, 2001), 55.

148 Adrian, *Intr.* 73.4 (MARTENS, 240,1–2); cf. Theodore, *Comm. in Zach.* 14,20 (GO 5/1,399,10–11): εἰωθεν ἀπὸ μέρους τὰ πλείστα δηλοῦν ἢ θεία γραφή, ὅταν περιττὴν ἡγῆται τὴν κατὰ μέρος ἀκριβολογίαν; *Comm. in Ps.* 15,9 (ST 93,98,12–25); and the identification of *synecdoche*, in Os 4,17, where Ephraim is the more powerful (δυνατωτέρας) tribe of Israel, which stands for the whole concept of Israel; a fuller list is in Schäublin, *Untersuchungen*, 111 n. 104; for Diodore, see Mariès, *Études*, 119; Lausberg, *Handbook*, § 295, 572.

149 Details in Chapter 5.

were indecisive as to their answer (Eusebius says it could be either to Joseph, his son, or the staff), Chrysostom saw an opportunity to create a prophetic typology out of the scene. Precisely because it is bizarre and unclear does it warrant a special explication and the development of a moral 'treasure'. Heb 11,21 mentions Jacob's faith in relation to this blessing scene, and this signals to Chrysostom that the bowing was a prophetic acknowledgement of the child who would come from this 'royal race'.¹⁵⁰ 'Do you see' (ὁρᾷς) he marks at several points in the passage, Jacob is 'foreseeing' (προορῶν) an action that resolves the potential contradiction and inserts in its place a memorable connection of this text with the New Testament. 'Foretelling' and 'foreseeing' occur several times elsewhere in the homily, binding his discourse around the prophetic significance of events at the end of the book of Genesis (cf. 2.4.2, above, on Metaphor). For instance, the sequence of Ephrem before Manessah in a blessing text 'is foretelling' (προαναφωνῶν) the kingdom of Christ, a type of seeing which requires the 'eyes of faith' which 'form an image [φαντάζονται] of things that are due to happen many generations later'.¹⁵¹ Chrysostom's non-literal interpretation disagrees with his Antiochene predecessors' specific take on Jacob's death-bed scene. Yet he knows this is an objectionable text, and he knows other tools such as the formulaic definition of synecdoche which can be applied for a mimetic typology. Chrysostom shows a relatively high degree of freedom for the purposes of creating a red-thread throughout his discourse.

Closely related to synecdoche is the trope of metonymy. Chrysostom claims that it is the 'habit' (ἔθος) of Scripture to name places based 'from the actions [πραγμάτων] that have occurred in those places [τόποις]'.¹⁵² In *Homily 16 on Genesis*, this is demonstrated in the name of the tree in the garden, the 'Tree of the knowledge of Good and Evil'. An objection to the text in the form of a problem (ζήτημα) arises around the possibility that Adam and Eve received moral discernment, knowledge of good and evil, only after eating from the tree by that name—this is when God 'opened their eyes' (Gen 3,5).¹⁵³ Unable to accept the theological and anthropological implications of this picture, Chrysostom insists that the name of the tree is a metonymy for the things that happened

150 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 66.2 (PG 54.568; FOC 87.258).

151 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 66.3 (PG 54.570; FOC 87.262).

152 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 16.5 (PG 53.133).

153 See Morlet, 'Pourquoi Dieu', for an outline of exegetical traditions regarding this problem. The Emperor Julian was particularly concerned with this question, as demonstrated by Cook, *Interpretation*, 170–173, 258–262 and Boulnois, 'Le Contre les Galiléens'. Prior to him, however, Titus of Bostra and Eusebius of Emesa dealt with this objection extensively, discussed in Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 366–419.

around it, namely the disobedience of the first-created humans and the introduction of shame into their conscience. He makes the exact same point in his *Sermons 7 and 8 on Genesis*. Regarding the tree, he repeats three times that it is a habit of scripture to designate an 'action' (πράγμα) according to a 'place' (τόπον) or time.¹⁵⁴ Schäublin explained metonymy in Theodore's works as 'Container-for-the-Content', a structure related especially to the connection of a place (τόπον) to the actions which transpire there.¹⁵⁵ For instance, 'Do not go towards Galgala' (Os 12,11) is an injunction not to possess idols, for it is known that idol worship is rife 'in this place'.¹⁵⁶ Here the 'container' Galgala stands for the content of idol worship, just as for Chrysostom the Tree stands for the content of shame. In an anonymous Syriac homily representative of Antiochene exegetical interests, an understanding of the tree similar to that of Chrysostom is given: 'It gives the name of the two things [good and evil] to the tree by which each one has become manifest: obedience and disobedience—just as one could give to a place a name recalling what happened there'.¹⁵⁷ Yet again we see how mention of 'habit' coincides for Chrysostom with the raising of a 'question' treated in previous and contemporary exegetical models, and his answers and grammatical techniques at once parallel other authors and stand alone as contextual applications. Digging further into the traditional text web of Gen 3,7 will illustrate further.

Eusebius of Emesa reflected at length on the problem of what, exactly the 'knowledge' means, concluding that there is a fine distinction between the knowledge of evil and the actual practice of evil, the former which God gave as natural law in relation to the image of God, the latter which he bid them to avoid.¹⁵⁸ Theodore, Diodore, and Titus dealt with an objection asking whether 'what was spoken by the Devil to the woman has been fulfilled', namely that in eating, their eyes shall be opened—which indeed they were—

154 John Chrysostom, *Serm. Gen.* 8.26–27 (SC 433.348); 7.190–192 (ibid., 320); 7.222–227 (ibid., 322), where Jacob's well (Gen 32,3–31) is called 'I saw God' because there Jacob saw God insofar as human capacity allowed.

155 Schäublin, *Untersuchungen*, 113; cf. Lausberg, *Handbook*, §568.2–4; Adrian, *Intr.* 73.6 (MARTENS, 240,17–21): κατὰ μετωνυμίαν· ὅταν ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν περιεχόντων τὰ περιεχόμενα ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκουμένων τοὺς οἰκοῦντας μετονομάζει.

156 Theodore, *Comm. in Os.* 12,11 (GO 5/1.67,7–9).

157 Anonymous, *Hom. BL Add.* 17,189 (OrSyr 5.266–267). The biblical quotations in this text do not derive from the Peshitta, but rather the Septuagint, indicating that it is a translation from a Greek original. The most recent scholarship has suggested Basil or John Chrysostom (163).

158 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 20g (TEG 15.63).

gaining knowledge of good and evil and god-likeness.¹⁵⁹ Precisely on this point Julian had ridiculed the Genesis narrative, for he viewed the serpent as a 'benefactor' (εὐεργέτην) to the human race who had been denied knowledge of good and evil by the envious creator.¹⁶⁰ This particular question about the devil's apparent benefaction and prophetic ability differs from Chrysostom's concern about whether Adam and Eve were equipped with moral discernment in the first place, the more fundamental issue at work in Julian's ridicule. Whatever the precise source of Chrysostom's knowledge of the *zētēma*, it is clearly set against a complex and highly developed nexus between apologetic concerns and questions-and-answers Genesis commentary. Noteworthy is that his ingenuity emerges again by his application of a literary device to a question-and-answer sequence that relates to complex discussions of his contemporaries. Chrysostom retains the Theodoran themes of the introduction of immortality and the affirmation of the full capacity of free will and moral discernment as a way of defending the inculpability of God.

2.4 Summary

The nature of the data regarding explanations of 'habit' in the *Homilies on Genesis* excels in quality, less so quantity. To his grammatical points Chrysostom frequently attached engagement with previous models of exegesis that related to pagan criticism and trinitarian theological debates. Regarding trinitarian debates, sophisticated discussion of the temporal 'until' and divine duplicate names stands out, for not only do his discussions compare well with previous models, but they are refined in a way that makes clear connections to his own moral pedagogy. Several cases analysed above demonstrate departures from Antiochene material while at the same time using strikingly similar definitions and reference techniques. In the case of the metaphorical and prophetic referents of Gen 49, he departs from his Antiochene predecessors and uses Eusebius of Caesarea's explanations. But it is not only a borrowing of Eusebius's referents: Chrysostom uses the density of the prophetic references to expand into other non-literal interpretations in the discourse and effectively establish Joseph's suffering as a mirror for his audience, emphasizing the anticipatory character of the Christian life in the face of suffering and performing acts of forgiveness. Not all cases are departures, however. He is quite at home among the Antiochenes in the objection regarding the tree and the knowledge imparted—perhaps

159 Theodore?/Diodore?, *Coisl.* 115 (CCSG 15.118–119). Attribution, contextualization with other genuine fragments, and comparison to Titus are discussed in the illuminating Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 399–407.

160 Julian, *C. Gal. fr.* 17 [Mas] *apud* Cyril, *C. Jul.* 3.29.5 (GCS NF 20.207).

they were motivated by a response to Julian. Even here, though, he draws on scholastic resources, such as his definition of metonym and his identification of *zētēma*.

The formulaic nature of his definitions of literary devices is noteworthy, not just from the fact that they attest to shared traditions, many codified by Adrian, but for their rhetorical import and adaptability. A stand-out case is the synecdoche of Jacob's bowing, wherein the character of Jacob himself captures the movement of blessing, humility, and foreshadowing that courses throughout the whole discourse. As here, in comparison to other Antiochene treatments, he seems to home in texts for which he knows there is a developed tradition of commentary, identifying a 'question' for comment where others had, but presenting the problem to his audience slightly differently than previous models.

3 Onomastic Interpretation

A final angle from which to consider Chrysostom's linguistic comments is his use of onomastic interpretation, the provision of a Greek translation of a Hebrew word. This resembles etymology, the breaking of a word into constituent parts for assessment. It is of course not the same thing, even though a fifth-century grammatical lexical tradition leaves room for porous boundaries when it famously defined etymology as 'the finding of the name's interpretation' (ὀνομασίας εὕρισκειν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἐρμηνείαν).¹⁶¹ Scholiasts often marked this practice with the expression [ἦ] παρὰ τό.¹⁶² In Christian circles onomastic interpretation is to be distinguished from the study of alternative versions. Among Antiochenes the latter is championed by Eusebius of Emesa, followed by Diodore,¹⁶³ for a corrective approach to the Septuagint based on the *recen-*

161 H. Peraki-Kyriakou, 'Aspects of Ancient Etymologizing', *CQ* 52 (2002), 481; cf. Sextus Empiricus, *Adv. Gramm.* 1.241–247 (SEO 3.60–61; BLANK, 48–49); Dionysius Thrax, *Ars gramm.* 1 (GG 1/1.5.3–6.3) locates interpretation of glosses and histories next to the discovery of etymology (ἐτυμολογίας εὕρεσις).

162 Peraki-Kyriakou, 'Aspects of Ancient Etymologizing', 483–484.

163 F. Petit, 'La tradition de Théodoret de Cyr dans les chaînes sur la Genèse', *Le Muséon* 92 (1979), 1–21 established through the *catenae* traditions that Diodore derived his philological method from his predecessor Eusebius of Emesa, particularly the citations of the Syriac translation of the Old Testament. Ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 82–88 clarified further that all Diodore's readings of 'The Syrian' derive from Eusebius of Emesa. For a clear case of this phenomenon regarding onomastic interpretation, compare Diodore, *Coisl.* 204,22–24 (CCSG 15.200–201) and Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 78 (TEG 15.130) in which the place Sabek (Σαβεκ) is explained as a plant name in Greek but in Hebrew meaning 'remission'. See discussion in ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 328. It is Diodore's reference to the absence

tiores and Eusebius's own *ad hoc* Greek renderings from a proto-Peshitta Syriac Old Testament. Eusebius and Diodore rarely used onomastic interpretative traditions, relying instead on their independent access to the *recentiores* or Eusebius's Syriac renderings.¹⁶⁴ Origen, though, had practiced both onomastic interpretation and etymology, studying either word derivations and constituent parts or by finding a direct Hebrew to Greek translation.¹⁶⁵ In turn, Didymus's onomastic interpretations relied on Origen's works and those of his Jewish predecessor, Philo.¹⁶⁶ The prominence of onomastic interpretation in Alexandrian authors testifies to their affinity with Stoic theories of language which dealt with the relationship between thought and thing, or vocal *logos* and intelligible *logos*, and played a major role in their psychological allegorizations of scripture.¹⁶⁷ As we shall see, by his own rhetorical framing, Chrysostom

of this word in the Syriac that indicates the whole explanation, including the onomastic interpretation, is taken from Eusebius. I have been able to find only one case where Diodore makes an onomastic explanation (seemingly) independent of Eusebius: Diodore, *Coisl.* 306,8–12 (CCSG 15,284): 'Laisan ... for Dan lies at the end of their entire land' (Λάϊσαν ... κείται γὰρ ἡ Δάν ἐσχάτη πάσης τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν), cf. the loose correspondence in Eusebius of Caesarea, *Onom.* Λ' 645 (GCS NF 24.156,2–3): 'a boundary of the part extending' (ὅριον τῆς διηκούσης). The explanation is not in the Armenian version of Eusebius of Emesa's *Commentary on Genesis*.

- 164 Ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, esp. 100–112; 133. Diodore cited the *recentiores* four more times than Eusebius of Emesa. These authors do explain obscure place-names and proper nouns in terms of their Semitic meanings. But Eusebius appears to have done this primarily from the basis of his own knowledge of the *recentiores*, Hebrew, and Syriac, and not the Eusebian traditions with whom he rarely agrees. One such case of agreement is Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 1158 (TEG 3.165): 'Just as the Hebrew says, "until the swallowing" (ὁ Ἐβραῖος οὕτω λέγει: «ἕως τῆς καταπιούσης»)', cf. Jerome, *Interp. Hebr. Nom.* s.v. Bale (CCSL 72/1.62): 'rushing down or swallowing' (*praecipitans sive devorans*). Jerome adds a similar comment (*Bala autem interpretatur absorpta*) in his translation of Eusebius of Caesarea, *Onom.* Z' 193 (GCS NF 24.51*,15). But as ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 313 remarks, this parallel notwithstanding, 'It is not necessary to assume that Eusebius used the *Onomasticon* of his Caesarean namesake'.
- 165 Neuschäfer, *Origenes*, 1:145–146; Martens, *Origen*, 54–55; cf. Guinot, 'L'exégèse allégorique', 101; R.P.C. Hanson, 'Interpretations of Hebrew Names in Origen', VC 10.2 (1956) 103–123, esp. 106–107.
- 166 J.M. Rogers, *Didymus the Blind and the Alexandrian Christian Reception of Philo*, SPM 8 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2017), 125–141, esp. 140. For Philo's role in Christian onomastic interpretation, particularly Origen, see D.T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*, CRI 3 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993), 181–182; for Jerome, see 316–319. In his translation of Eusebius's *Onomasticon*, Jerome, *Interp. Hebr. nom.* pro. (CCEL 72/1.59,1–60,3), says that Philo, too, had a book on Hebrews names.
- 167 D. Robertson, *Word and Meaning in Ancient Alexandria. Theories of Language from Philo to Plotinus*. (London: Routledge, 2008); Martens, *Origen*, 55. Dionysius Thrax, *Ars. Gramm.*

favored onomastic interpretations when mentioning Semitic languages, blurring the lines with the study of alternative versions championed by his predecessors. Remarkably, the contents of his interpretations have much in common with Alexandrian resources.

3.1 *Onomastic Interpretation and the Homilies on Genesis*

Onomastic interpretation played a considerable role in Chrysostom's methods of biblical interpretation. Although he viewed the Greek bible as a providential means for reaching the whole of the known world with the gospel, in his Antiochene *Homily 2 on the Obscurity of the Old Testament*, he understood precisely this universal spread as a 'cause [αἴτιον] of its obscurity [δυσκολίας].'¹⁶⁸ More specifically, in likely-Antiochene works, he recognized that the feature of name changes in the bible was an obstacle for comprehension and therefore an opportunity for bringing out deeper meanings below the surface. He addressed this in a micro-sermon series, wherein traditions of onomastic interpretations feature prominently.¹⁶⁹ At one point, for example, he discusses the different meanings of the names Abram and Abraham, which reoccurs in his *Homily 39 on Genesis* and in *Homily 2 on Isaiah*.¹⁷⁰ To substantiate his interpretations,

12 (GG 1/1.24,1–6) for the etymological analysis of the components of the noun, with discussion in S. Menn, 'The Stoic Theory of Categories', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 17 (1999), 215–247.

168 John Chrysostom, *De proph. obsc.* 2.2.34–56 (vs 12.116–117); cf. *In ep. ad Heb. hom.* 8 (EP 7.110d–111b) and *In Gen. hom.* 4.4 (PG 53.42–44) for presentations of the providential translation of the Septuagint. For contextualizing his account of this story in relation to that given in other patristic authors, see Harl in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *La Bible grecque*, 294–295, ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 100–140 and A. Wasserstein–D.J. Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 110–128, esp. 125 on Chrysostom, though leaning too heavily on the primacy of 'the Greek paradigm'.

169 John Chrysostom, *In prin. Acta* 4 (PG 51.97–112) + *De mut. nom. hom.* 1–2 (PG 51.113–132) + *Sermo 9 in Gen.* (PG 54.619–630). The remaining *De mut. nom. hom.* 3–4 may not be definitively ascribed to this series, because *De mut. nom. hom.* 4.3 (PG 51.148): ἵστε ὅτι τρεῖς ἡμέρας ὀλοκλήρου ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος [Παύλου] διελέχθη μόνον, clearly connects *De mut. nom. hom.* 3–4 to a series 'on the name of Paul.' See Mayer, 'The Sequence and Provenance' 179–180 and *ibid.* 'Les homélies de Jean Chrysostome: problèmes concernant la provenance, l'ordre et la datation', *RÉAug* 52 (2006), 347–348 for further reasoning on the separation of *De mut. nom. hom.* 3–4 from 1–2. See Mayer 'The Sequence and Provenance', 176–177 for the interrelation of *De mut. nom. hom.* 1–2 and *Sermo 9 in Gen.* Finally, see Mayer 'The Sequence and Provenance', 182–184 for the separation of *In prin. Act* 1–3 from 4 and the latter's connection to *De mut. nom. hom.* 1–2 + *Sermo 9 in Gen.*

170 John Chrysostom, *Sermo 9 in Gen.* 3–5 (PG 54.624–628); *In Gen. hom.* 39.3 (PG 53.364); *In*

in these three likely-Antiochene works, he references what the names ‘mean’ (ἐρμηνεύεται) in the Hebrew or Syriac languages.

It is likely that Chrysostom focused on names and their interpretation because the provision of onomastic interpretations is a habit of the biblical text itself. For instance, in Acts 9,40 Tabitha’s name is ‘interpreted’ (διερμηνευομένη) as Dorkas. This is a good case for viewing how such textual patterns attracted traditions of interpretation, for while Acts 9,40 does not explain the meaning of these names in more direct terms, Christian commentators regularly repeated the Dorkas interpretation when mentioning Tabitha as an example of almsgiving.¹⁷¹ In aetiological narratives, of course, the Septuagint text did give name-explanations as a matter of literary style.¹⁷² Duped by his father-in-law, Jacob marries Leah instead of his desired Rachel. He ends up with both as his wife, however, and ‘he loved Rachel more than Leah’ (Gen 29,30). But earlier God had promised Leah that in response to her faithfulness he would make her fruitful and her descendants numerous (Gen 28,15). Thus, when she conceives and gives birth to her sons, Reuben, Symeon, Levi, and Judah (Gen 29,33–35), the Biblical text provides corresponding onomastic interpretations based loosely on the etymology of their names according to pivotal scenes in Leah’s life: humiliation (Reuben), hearing (Symeon), favor (Levi), and confession (Judah). The text introduces the interpretations through formulas like ‘she called him Rouben, saying, “Because the Lord has seen my humiliation”’. Chrysostom took advantage of cases like these. ‘In the Hebrew language’ (Ἑβραϊκῇ διαλέκτῳ), he surmises, ‘the name Symeon means “she was heard”’.¹⁷³ But his resources and rhetorical application extends beyond restatement of the text.

In Table 3 below I arrange all of his onomastic interpretations in the *Homilies on Genesis*, excluding those explicitly given in the biblical text where the name occurs. I include examples which relate to context or rely on other bib-

Oz. *hom.* 2.2.85–87 (sc 277.96). In the latter text, he mentions his own work περὶ ὀνομάτων.

171 Origen, *Hom. Jer.* 19.13.43–45 (sc 238.228): ἡ τὰς ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσας Ταβιθά, ἥτις ἐρμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς, κάτω οὐκ ἦν, ἀλλ’ ἐν τῷ ὑπερώῳ; Didymus, *Cat. in Acta* 9,40 (CGPNT 3.167): Σημειώτεον ὅτι καὶ μέχρι γυναικῶν φθάνει τὸ τῶν μαθητῶν ὄνομα καὶ ἡ ἀξία τῆς ἐπωνυμίας ... ὡς ἄρα ἡ Δορκάς.

172 H. Ausloos–B. Lemmelijn–V. Kabergs. ‘The Study of Aetiological Wordplay as a Content-Related Criterion in the Characterisation of LXX Translation Technique’, in S. Kreuzer et al. (eds.), *Die Septuaginta: Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte*, WUNT 286 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 273–294.

173 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 56.4 (PG 54.491; FOC 87.126).

TABLE 3 Complete onomastic interpretations in the *Homilies on Genesis*

Biblical name	Interpretation	English translation	Genesis	PG; FOC
Ἀβραμ	Περάτης	Traveler	17,4–6	53.364; 82.380
Βαβυλών	Σύγχυσις	Confusion	11,2	53.279; 82.230
Ζαρᾶ	Ἀνατολή	Rising	38,30	54.535; 87.202
Ἰακώβ	Πτερνισμός	Supplanting	25,26	54.452; 87.57
Ἰσραήλ	Ὁρών θεόν	Seeing god	32,28	54.509; 87.159
Μελχὶ	Βασιλείαν	Kingdom	14,8	53.327; 82.315
Ναῖδ	Σάλος	Tossing	4,12–14	53.167; 82.36
Νῶε	Ἀνάπαυσις	Relief	5,29	53.182; 82.62
Σαλήμ	Εἰρήνην	Peace	14,18	53.327; 82.315
Σεδέκ	Δικαιοσύνην	Righteousness	14,18	53.327; 82.315
Φαλέκ	Μερισμόν	Division	10,25	53.279; 82.230
Φαρές	Διακοπήν; μερισμός	Breach; division	38,30	54.534; 87.202
Ψομομφανήχ	Τῶν κρυπτῶν γνώστης	Diviner of secrets	41,44–45	54.545; 87.220

lical texts to provide interpretations, such as the quotation of Heb 7 in the context of Gen 15. In Column 1 I provide the name envisioned in the biblical text. In Column 2 is Chrysostom's interpretation of the name in Column 1. Column 3 is Hill's FOC translation of the interpretation given in Column 2. Column 4 is the biblical text in which the name occurs, and Column 5 provides the references to the PG and FOC. In the following sections, I study these cases by first assessing the surrounding formulas, and then elaborating how Chrysostom amplifies them in contextual discourses and their relation to previous models.

3.2 *Framing Onomastic Interpretations*

In several of the above cases, the Septuagint translator evidently endeavored to preserve original wordplay. While this facilitated onomastic interpretation, tools were still required for those without Hebrew to make the identification explicit. In Gen 10,25, for instance, we read that the land was 'divided up' (ἐμερίσθη) during the lifetime of Phalek. It would involve quite an inferential task to conclude that the substantial noun form of this verb given by Chrysostom (μερισμόν) somehow may be selected for interpretation of the Hebrew name Phalek. More likely is that a source relating to or stemming from Josephus or Eusebius enabled him to see the connection and emphasize a concept already present in the biblical text that captures the narrative about

language division.¹⁷⁴ Chrysostom brings out this impression of learned patterns, framing his onomastic interpretations with various references to word study.

First, we may consider the interplay between expressions such as ‘interpret’ (ἐρμηνεύειν, 7×),¹⁷⁵ ‘signify’ (σημαίνειν),¹⁷⁶ or ‘employs some degree of etymology’ (ἐτυμολογίᾳ τινὶ χέχρηται),¹⁷⁷ and specification statements for the meaning, such as ‘which is’ (ὅπερ ἐστὶ). Indicative of his Antiochene context, Chrysostom relates these interpretations to the Hebrew (or Syriac), with expressions like ‘according to the Hebrew language’ (κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραϊκὴν γλῶτταν), as in the case of interpreting Abram (Gen 17,4–6) and Melchizedek (Gen 14,18),¹⁷⁸ or the Hebrew ‘word’ (λέξις) Naid as ‘tossing’ (Gen 4,12–14).¹⁷⁹ Eusebius of Emesa uses similar formulations in his *Commentary on Genesis*: ‘the Hebrew language’; (ἡ Ἑβραίων γλῶσσα); ‘a’ or ‘the’ Hebrew, which may refer to either informants (Ἑβραῖός τις) about a Hebrew text or to an exegetical tradition; through these very informants, the Hebrew text itself (ὁ Ἑβραῖος / τὸ Ἑβραϊκόν / ‘according to,’ ἥτοι Ἑβραϊκῶν).¹⁸⁰ But to what, exactly, is Chrysostom referring when he mentions Semitic languages?

From the vantage point of his wider *œuvre*, the mention of the Hebrew language is almost sure indication that he was relying on some onomastic source. On six occasions he references word meanings ‘in the Hebrew language’ ([τῇ] Ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ / γλῶττει), and these are not textual variants but onomastic interpretations, such as the meaning of Beliar as ‘apostate’ (2 Cor 6,15) and Seraphim as ‘flaming mouth’ (Isa 6,2).¹⁸¹ Sometimes these merge with the Syriac language, as in the interpretation of Noah as ‘relief’ in the *Sermon 9 on Genesis*, where ‘the one relieving’ is *Nia* in Syriac, which he says corresponds to the noun

174 The μερισμὸν reading is found in Eusebius of Caesarea, *Onom.* B’ 191 (GCS NF 24.49); Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* 1.117–118 (FIO 1.27,16–28,1).

175 E.g. John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 20.1 (PG 53.167); 21.5 (53.182); 35.5 (53.327); 51.1 (54.452); 58.2 (54.509); 62.2 (54.534); 63.4 (54.545).

176 *Ibid.*, 30.4 (PG 53.279).

177 *Ibid.*, 35.5 (PG 53.327–328; FOC 82.315).

178 *Ibid.*, 35.5 (PG 53.327); 39.3 (PG 53.364).

179 *Ibid.*, 20.1 (PG 53.167).

180 Ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 49–52; Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* pro. (TEG 15.24).

181 John Chrysostom, *In ep. ii ad Cor. hom.* 13 (EP 3.153e): Beliar as ‘apostate’ (ἀποστάτην); *Comm. Isa.* 6.2,50–51 (SC 304.262) Seraphim as ‘flaming mouth’ (ἔμπυρα στόματα); *In Matt.* 2 (MT 1.19a): Jesus as in the Greek language means savior (σωτήρ), ‘to save his people’; *In ep. ii ad Cor. hom.* 26 (EP 3.269e): Satan as ‘the one lying in opposition’ (ὁ ἀντιτείνων); *ibid.* in *In sanct. Eust.* 3 (PG 50.603); *Sermo 9 in Gen.* 5 (PG 54.628): Noah as ‘the one resting’ (ἀναπαύων).

form, 'relief'.¹⁸² The matter of his references to 'the Hebrew' as marking textual variants is difficult, as the majority of the cases (×37) in his attributed *œuvre* come from his *Commentary on the Psalms* (PG 55).¹⁸³ In three cases outside this work, however, he references textual variants according to the Hebrew (ὁ Ἑβραῖος) and equivocates this reading with the Syriac (ὁ Σύρος), indicating that he drew the readings, albeit imprecisely, from an (Antiochene?) source such as Eusebius of Emesa.¹⁸⁴ Thus, when he references the 'Hebrew language' in his *Homilies on Genesis*, he is referring to onomastic sources, but it is likely that he received some variant readings second-hand. Chrysostom frames these sources as learned contemporaries with whom he could consult. Material from the *Genesis* homilies may be brought together with his other works to elaborate.

He is clear about this, when, in *Homily 4 on Genesis*, after explaining that the Greek word 'heaven' is idiomatically spoken in the plural in Hebrew, he enlists both 'those who know' (ἐπιστάμενοι) Hebrew and Syriac as 'agreeing'

182 John Chrysostom, *Sermo 9 in Gen.* 5 (PG 54.628).

183 See Chapter 2, n. 90 for discussion of attribution problems.

184 John Chrysostom, *Comm. Isa.* 7.8.37–38 (SC 304.330): 'Just as the Hebrew and Syrian do not say "bees" but "wasps"' (Ὁ Σύρος καὶ ὁ Ἑβραῖος, ὡς φασιν, οὐ λέγουσι, μελίσσας, ἀλλὰ, Σφήκας); *In ep. ii ad Cor. hom.* 3.6 (EP 3.44): 'The Syrian says, "Now that you have known", which is to human beings' (Ὁ μὲν Σύρος φησί, Νῦν ἐγνώρισας, τουτέστι, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις). I include in this numeration *In ep. ad Heb. hom.* 22 (EP 7.251.10–13): It says that "Fire descended and consumed the sacrifices"; instead of "He Looked on Abel, and upon his sacrifice," the Syrian says, "And He burned up [the sacrifices]" (λέγεται πῦρ κετελθὼν ἀναλαβεῖν τὰς θυσίας, ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ Ἐπὶ Ἀβελ ἐπέβλειψε, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς θυσίας αὐτοῦ, ὁ Σύρος, «Καὶ ἐνεπύρισεν», εἶπεν). This last reading is a confusion; ἐνεπύρισεν is the reading of Theodotion (*Hexapla* ad loc., FIELD 117). Ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 225 and 320 shows that for the first two, Chrysostom witnesses the same traditions as Eusebius of Emesa but as his manner of quotation is imprecise, we cannot specify further his source. If genuine, to these Syriac references we may add *Expos. In Ps. XLVIII* 3 (PG 55.226a), where alongside the LXX 'day of wrath', the Chrysostom text gives the following alternatives: the 'other' (ἄλλος) has 'evil' (πονηροῦ), and 'the Syrian has *Rah*' (ὁ Σύρος, Ρᾶ). See ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 82–83 for the conclusion that all Syriac bible readings from Genesis in Greek patristic authors likely derive from Eusebius of Emesa or else an unknown Antiochene source. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum*, 1: LXXVII surmised that the one Syriac reading he had recovered in Chrysostom was really a *lapsu graphico* for the Hebrew. The case of *Comm. Isa* 7.8.37 mentioned above, however, escaped his notice. Outside of Genesis, the picture is more complex for the sources of Antiochene Syriac readings. Theodoret seems to know Syriac independently, see H. Lehmann, 'Evidence of the Syriac bible Translation of the Old Testament—as Evidenced around the Middle of the Fourth Century (in Eusebius of Emesa)', *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 1 (1987), 66–86. But figures like Theodore and Apollinarius who cite 'the Syrian' a few times in their prophet commentaries likely relied on earlier, untraceable Antiochene traditions (Guinot, 'La fortune', 218). Devreesse, *Théodore*, 57, supposed that Theodore had some form of the Hexapla. But this would not explain the ὁ Σύρος readings in Theodore's *Commentary on the Psalms* and on the *Prophets*.

(συνομολογούσι) on this point.¹⁸⁵ He spoke this way elsewhere in his work. ‘Those who have used [χεχρημένοι] the Syriac language’ know a helpful elucidation and paraphrase of ‘Raka’ in Mt 5,38.¹⁸⁶ In explaining the interpretation of Zorobabel, ‘those who know [ἴσασι] the Syriac language’ can confirm that this name means ‘he was produced there’, an interesting case of genuine etymological interpretation used to refute his contemporary, Theodore.¹⁸⁷ Theodore had taken Mic 5,1–2 as a reference ‘concerning Zorobabel’ (περὶ τοῦ Ζοροβάβελ) and found that only one part of the text ‘might be harmonized’ (ἀρμόσειεν ἄν) with David’s descendants.¹⁸⁸ Citing these exact expressions in his *Homily 7 on Matthew* Chrysostom ‘puts to shame’ the restrictive view, affirming that the whole pericope refers to Christ. An onomastic tradition in reference to the Syriac language thereby supports his engagement with a controversial non-literal interpretation.

Another way Chrysostom references his consulted sources is with the expression ‘those experienced’ (ἐμπειροί). When giving his interpretation of Abram as ‘traveler’ in *Homily 39 on Genesis*, ‘those experienced’ in the Hebrew language provide him this meaning.¹⁸⁹ Elsewhere, though, when rehearsing this same interpretation of Abram, he attributes his knowledge to those ‘expe-

185 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 4.4 (PG 53.43).

186 John Chrysostom, *In Matt. hom.* 16 (HM 1.228). According to Chrysostom’s use of this tradition, *Raka* is not a term of violation but ‘neglect’ (ὀλιγωρίας), as in saying ‘Away with you, tell this to such a person’.

187 John Chrysostom, *In Matt. hom.* 7 (HM 1.88c): διὰ τὸ ἐκεῖ σπαρῆναι. Σπείρω is a regular translation for שָׁרַף, e.g. Gen 1,11; 47,23; Nm 17,2; Zech 10,9. This is a rare etymology: it is not given in any onomastic tradition known to F. Wutz, *Onomastica Sacra. Untersuchungen zum Liber Interpretationis nominum hebraicorum des Hl. Hieronymus*, 2 vols., TU 41.1–2 (Leipzig, 1914), where the entries for Zorobabel derive the name from βαβελ, ἀπὸ συγχύσεως.

188 Theodore, *Comm. in Mic. ad* 5,1–2 (GO 5/1.213,23), where the prophecy is ‘clearly spoken of Zorobabel’ (δῆλον ... περὶ τοῦ Ζοροβάβελ), but the fulfillment (ἐκβασιν) is in Christ. Theodore finds that one part of the prophetic text ‘would clearly apply’ (εὐδῆλον ... ἀρμόσειεν ἄν) to David’s descendants, the kings of Israel. When Chrysostom *In Matt. hom.* 7 (HM 1.88c) speaks ‘concerning Zorobabel’ (περὶ τοῦ Ζοροβάβελ), the issue is about how, if Mic 5,1–2 referred to Zorobabel alone, one part of the text ‘may apply’ (ἀρμόσειεν ἄν) to another, namely the mention of the messianic figure’s birthplace and the time frame ‘from the beginning’. J.-N. Guinot, ‘La cristallisation d’un différend: Zorobabel dans l’exégèse de Théodore de Mopsueste et de Théodore de Cyr’, *Augustinianum* 24 (1984), 527–547, esp. 263–265 studies Theodore’s attempt to maintain the applications to both Zorobabel and Christ. Following Chrysostom, Theodore insisted, in the form of anti-Jewish polemic, that Zorobabel was a type of Christ.

189 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 39.3 (PG 53.364).

rienced' rather in the Syriac language.¹⁹⁰ Consistency of interpretation but inconsistency of attributed source is telling of a scholastic context that Chrysostom loosely reproduced. Further, it is people 'experienced in many languages' that are his authorities for stating that it is impossible to retain clarity when translating the Old Testament from Hebrew to Greek.¹⁹¹ In *Homily 2 on the Changing of Names*, he again references these 'experienced' persons when discussing the 'answer' (ἀνσιν) to some 'questions' (ζητήματα) about the beginning of the bible.¹⁹² These questions concern names. First, what is the meaning of Adam? Answer: 'of the earth' (γῆνιον) 'of the dust' (χοϊκός). Second, what is the meaning of Eden? 'One should inquire [διερωτάτω] of those experienced [ἐμπείρους] in the Hebrew language'. For then it would be found, he goes on, that this name means 'virgin earth' (παρθένος γῆ), a known onomastic tradition which explains the fertility of the garden of Eden.¹⁹³ Here, the combination of questions-and-answers with precise adaptation of onomastic traditions provides a dimension of research to Chrysostom's argument.

3.3 Making Meaning with Onomastic and Exegetical Traditions

In general, Chrysostom provides an onomastic interpretation when it can act as a synecdoche for the narrative at hand. His method is to find an interpretation that embodies what he sees as an important pneumonic device for capturing the thrust of the moral lesson. As he puts it in *Homily 51 on Genesis*, 'by interpreting each name precisely, you will find in every case some hint [αἰνιττομένην] being given'.¹⁹⁴ Names have the capacity to represent one 'forefront' or 'heading' (μέτωπον) or to be the 'reminder' (ὑπόμνησις) of the significance of the whole passage.¹⁹⁵

Often, we can locate Chrysostom's sources in proximity to known onomastic traditions, but the complexity of these cases varies. Sometimes the matter is simpler and reported offhand. Take for instance his mention that Phalek (Gen 10,25) means 'division', for Eber, Phalek's father, 'retained the same language as he had before' the collapse of the Babel tower—implying that Hebrew endured the split and continued to Abram's lineage, an idea stemming from an

190 Ibid., *Sermo 9 in Gen.* 3 (PG 54.625).

191 Ibid., *De proph. obsc.* 2.2.30–34 (VS 12.116); Léonas, *Recherches*, 98; Harl, 'L'«obscurité», 336.

192 John Chrysostom, *De mut. nom. hom.* 2.3 (PG 51.129).

193 Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* 1.34 (F10 1.10,12); Ps.-Gregory Thaumaturgus, *In ann. Sanct.*, PG 10.1152.

194 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 51.1 (PG 54.452; FOC 87.58).

195 Ibid., 20.1 (PG 53.167; FOC 82.36); in 63.4 (PG 54.545), Psomthamphanech is the 'enduring reminder' (διηνεκή τὴν μνήμην); *In Oz. hom.* 2.3.12–14 (SC 277.96): 'light on a lampstand, which is placed at the forefront of the text so as to prefigure [μετώπου τῶν γραμμάτων προτυποῦσι] the consulat [the subject] and thereby clarify all that follows'.

apocryphal account known to Diodore and Chrysostom alike.¹⁹⁶ Similarly, his knowledge of Jacob's name as 'supplanting' is shared by Didymus, but the two make very different use of this idea.¹⁹⁷ However, on the other hand, complex engagements with exegetical traditions are envisaged to connect to Chrysostom's onomastic interpretations.

Like in his confrontation of Theodore's exegesis of the Zorobabel pericope, the perspective of Chrysostom's interpretation of names shows that he is willing to view entire passages or pericopes as referencing a single non-literal (often Christological or ecclesial) subject, verging at points on what Bucur has called the 're-envisioned' bible. In the *Homilies on Genesis*, Chrysostom enacted this rewriting by identifying biblical names which functioned as a 'type' (τύπος) of things to come, or referencing the New Testament events as 'strong' (ισχύς) over their Old Testament counterparts.¹⁹⁸ For example, when he comes to the names of Phares and Zara (Gen 38,30), he sees 'prefigured' (προδιετυπούτο) the structure of the elder ceding place to the younger. He understands this to mean Jewish legal obedience 'ceding place' (ὑποχωρήσαντος) to the way of life of the Church.¹⁹⁹ He starts with Phares, who is born first. The priority of

196 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 30.4 (PG 53.279; FOC 82.230). Dorival, 'Le patriarche Héber', 194–201 shows that an apocryphal text is at work in Chrysostom's understanding. In a text attributed to John Chrysostom, *Synopsis Scripturae sacrae*, PG 56.315, Eber's language is Hebrew (γλώσσα Ἑβραϊκή), an eponymous connection based on what 'an account holds' (PG 56.318, λόγος ἔχει). The authenticity of this text is discussed in G. Dorival, 'La *Prothēōria* de la *Synopsis* de Jean Chrysostome', *Theologische Zeitschrift* 62 (2006), 222–247. The relation of Eber to the Hebrew people and the Hebrew language is noted in some onomastic traditions, Wutz, *Onomastica sacra*, 1:82; 11:686, also known to Diodore, *Coisl.* 168 (CCSG 15.164–165); cf. Anonymous, *Cat.* 860 (TEG 2.214). For a survey of patristic debate about whether Hebrew was the original language of humanity, see Eskhult, 'The Primeval Language'. A glimpse into the ideological reasons for deploying such argumentation is in Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praep. Ev.* 10.14.2 (GCS 43/1.609, 15–17), who places Heber and the Hebrew language on the side of pre-Mosaic humanity, revered and pious men: 'The Hebrews, both Heber and Abram, from whom [come] ... the men ancient and friendly-with-god' (Ἑβραίων, Ἐβερ τε καὶ Ἀβραάμ, ἀφ' ὧν ... θεοφιλῶν τε καὶ παλαιῶν ἀνδρῶν).

197 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 51.1 (PG 54.452; FOC 87.57), where the name 'foretells' (προαναφώνησιν) as an oracle what is to come; Didymus, *Comm. Ps.* 294,30–31 (PTA 12.26), where with the ad loc. Psalter text, an allegory about deception is elaborated, as when the 'man of peace' (LXX-Ps 41,10) ends up as a deceiver.

198 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 51.1 (PG 54.452); 35.5 (PG 53.328); *In Heb. hom.* 17 (EP 7.207C–d); Pizzolato, 'L'antitipo', 188; J.-N. Guinot, 'L'école exégétique d'Antioche et ses relations avec Origène', in L. Perrone (ed.), *Origeniana Octava. Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition*, vol. 11, BETL 164b (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 1164–1165; *ibid.*, 'La typologie comme système herméneutique', in *Figures de l'Ancien Testament chez les Pères*, CBP 2 (Strasbourg: Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation patristiques, 1989), 1–34.

199 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 62.2 (PG 54.534).

Phares is signified by his name, which Chrysostom says means 'breach' (διακοπή) or 'division' (μερισμός). Next to this Chrysostom juxtaposes the name of Phares' brother, Zara, which according to our preacher means 'sunrise' (ἀνατολή). Following an onomastic tradition, for Chrysostom Zara takes a messianic sense. This onomastic tradition derived ἀνατολή from פֶּמָצ based on other messianic texts like Zech 3,6, where the Hebrew means 'branch', or 'growth' or even 'glow'.²⁰⁰ For Chrysostom the fact that Zara appears to be born first, but is actually born second, is an indication of the original primacy but delayed coming or 'rising' of the Church from the initial form of Jewish legal obedience. With Eusebius of Caesarea, he shares this rare interpretation of Zara as 'rising' (ἀνατολή), which Eusebius of Emesa does not discuss in his comments on the passage.²⁰¹

Onomastic traditions supported some of Chrysostom's direct Christological reflections as well. After wrestling with the mysterious divine character, Jacob, at this point in the narrative named Israel, claims that he has 'seen God face-to-face' (Gen 32,38). Chrysostom says this is justified because the name Israel means 'seeing God', which is to say that he was 'privileged to see God, insofar as it is possible for a human being to see him'.²⁰² It is a premonition that one day God would take on human form and liberate all human nature. But until then, he was in the habit of 'manifesting to each of them in the form of an appearance [ἐν σχήματι φαντασίας]'.²⁰³ To explain this historical feature of divine revelation he cites LXX-Os 12,11, 'I multiplied visions and by the hands of the prophets I

200 Harl in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante*, 219–222; cf. J. Lust, *Messianism and the Septuagint. Collected Essays*, BETL 178 (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 42–46, esp. 45; G. Bertram, 'Praeparatio Evangelica in der Septuaginta', *VT* 7 (1957) 225–249.

201 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Q. Ev.* 7.4–5 (SC 523.140–142); see Chapter 8 for demonstration that Chrysostom follows Eusebius of Caesarea's exegesis of this passage.

202 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 58.2 (PG 54.510; FOC 87.159). Gregory of Nyssa, *In Cant.* 8 (GNO 6.246,5–10) develops this theme considerably around the paradox of seeing in darkness, knowledge in the ignorance of the incomprehensible divinity, with discussion in M. Laird, *Gregory of Nyssa and the Grasp of Faith: Union, Knowledge and Divine Presence*, OECs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 84, 134, and M. Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique. Étude des rapports entre le langage et la connaissance de Dieu*, EAA 99 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1983), 340. In face of the onomastic interpretation of Jacob, similar reflections to Chrysostom are offered by Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praep. Ev.* 11.6.31 (GCS 43/2.18,12–13).

203 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 58.2 (PG 54.510; FOC 87.160, mod.). Lampe, *Lexicon*, 1471a notes mainly pejorative sense of the term φαντασία such as 'fantasy', but in the present context, this is too harsh. Presently, I use 'appearance' to emphasize Chrysostom's point in the context of this passage, which is that this divine appearance in the Jacob / Isaac narrative occurred in a distinctive way from the Incarnation but is not to be viewed in a negative light. My choice is distinguished from Os 12,11, 'visions' (ὁράσεις), quoted by Chrysostom in the following line.

was made an object of comparison'.²⁰⁴ When the divine says of himself that 'I was made an object of comparison' (ὡμοιωθῆν), Chrysostom understands this as the process of God presenting himself in appearances to the patriarchs and the prophets throughout the Old Testament.²⁰⁵ Invoked by the onomastic interpretation of Israel, for Chrysostom God appears here according to 'illusion' (φαντασία). Next to this he juxtaposes the 'appearance' of the Incarnation. When the divine took flesh, he did so 'not by appearance, not seemingly' (οὐ φαντασίᾳ, οὐδὲ δοκῆσει), 'but in truth' (ἀλλ' ἀληθείᾳ).²⁰⁶ The notion of analogous comparison invoked by the prophet Hosea does not apply to the Incarnation. In this, Chrysostom uses the language of the contemporary Christological controversy of his day to explain these biblical texts. Discussions in Gregory of Nazianzus and Chrysostom's mentor Diodore, some of which overlapped, are instructive for viewing this picture.²⁰⁷ Gregory insisted that the Word of God assumed the same 'passible flesh' (παθητὸν σαρκί) as humanity, while being 'impassible by divinity' (ἀπαθὴ θεότητι), and so 'entirely man' (ὅλος ἄνθρωπος) and entirely God.²⁰⁸ On the same topic, Diodore claimed that when the Word assumed this flesh, the result, as he thought suggested by Phil 2,7, was that he appeared 'like a human' (καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος).²⁰⁹ In using the ideas implied by the onomastic interpretation of Israel, Chrysostom links his discussion to wider debates about how

204 E. Bons–J. Joosten–S. Kessler, *Osée* BA 23/1 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2002), 152 for this translation.

205 Harl in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *La Bible grecque*, 307–308.

206 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 58.2 (PG 54.510). He makes a similar point earlier in the series; see *ibid.*, 1.3 (PG 53.24): 'So that it would not be supposed that he arrived in appearance [δοκῆσει], and did not take up flesh, apart from [ἐξῶ] the nature of our human situation [ἀνθρωπίνης]'.
 207 For recent contextual accounts of this interchange, see A. Hofer, *Christ in the Life and Teaching of Gregory of Nazianzus*, OECs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 146–147; Ch. Beeley, 'The Early Christological Controversy: Apollinarius, Diodore, and Gregory Nazianzen', VC 65.4 (2011), 376–407 and G. Voisin, *L'Apollinarisme. Étude historique, littéraire et dogmatique sur le début des controverses christologiques au IV^e siècle* (Leuven: Peeters, 1901), 285–290.

208 Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 101,14–15 (SC 208.42).
 209 Diodore, *Flor. Cod. Add.* 12156, §14 (BEHR, 178); see discussion of this aspect of the debate in Beeley, 'Controversy', 391. Behr's rendering of *καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος* as 'mere appearance' pushes too far; it is literally 'according to a man' or 'as far as a man'. We have seen, however, that surrounding this conversation, such an expression was entirely in place. R.A. Greer, 'The Antiochene Christology of Diodore of Tarsus', *JThS* 17.2 (1966), 333 discusses Diodore's denial of the notion that the relationship of the Word to the assumed flesh may be likened to the relationship between body and soul. Compare the present discussion of Phil 2,7, to Theodore, *Hom. Cat.* 8,55 (ST 145.193): 'Thus he is connatural with David and that which comes from his descentance' (*καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ὡς καὶ ὁ δαβὶδ καὶ ὡς καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ δαβὶδ*). Theodore, of course, makes this statement in reference to the human nature connoted

the divine appearances may be understood. He seems to take a line against his mentor, distinguishing between divine appearances that are according to likeness and that which is an actual divine manifestation, the Incarnation.

Name-interpretations were evidently central to Chrysostom's achievement of non-literal readings, and he often chose cases where developed exegetical and theological traditions could provide creative material with which to expand and apply across other layers of particular discourses. A more detailed case study of a homily dedicated almost entirely to the significance of names will illustrate this.

3.4 Case Study: Homily 20 on Genesis

In what follows I summarize *Homily 20 on Genesis* from Chrysostom's perspective, with PG 53 references in parenthesis as with the previous case studies. I then discuss the recurring emphasis on naming throughout the homily. Chrysostom finds 'deeper' meanings within a few names that provide a coherent thread for the narrative of Cain's wandering and the ensuing genealogy, some of whom are cases of Christian virtue exhibited in Old Testament characters.

The texts treated in this homily cover Gen 4,16–27. After Cain has murdered his brother Abel, a divine curse announces on him 'seven vengeance' and he is banished from the presence of God to roam the land of Naid, across from Eden (4,15–16). A genealogical narrative ensues, listing entries stemming from Cain's line such as Enoch, Mathousala (4,18), and Iobel and Ioubal who are said to relate to metallurgists, tent-dwellers, and inventors of music (4,20–21). From this considerable company, Lamek speaks out, admitting that he killed Cain (4,24). Meanwhile, it seems, Adam and Eve conceive a third child, Seth, who in turn conceives Enosh. Enosh's name indicates that the divine continues to be present to humanity (4,25–26).

3.4.1 Summary of *Homily 20*

Picking up where we left off earlier today, the Creator instills knowledge of good and evil in our nature, and this is reflected in our mindset (166)—whereby Cain's and Abel's sacrifices were measured in God's eyes. Pay attention very

by Phil 2,7, and in distinction from the divine nature. Tonneau–Devreesse gloss **ἡμῶν** as ὁμοούσιος. L. Pirot, *L'oeuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste*. (Rome: Institut biblique, 1913), 62–70 provides a still useful overview of Theodore's Christology, with a more recent incorporation of Syriac material in A. Kofsky–S. Ruzer, 'Shaping Christology in a Hermeneutical Context: Theodore of Mopsuestia's Endeavor in Face of Contemporary Challenges', *Adamantius* 19 (2013) 256–275.

carefully and you will see how Cain's choices and his consequences are dealt with in the following generations. But right away, you can see it: the Hebrew word *Naid* means tossing, so Cain is left to wander in fear and trembling.

When it says that Cain had a wife (Gen 4,17), we can preclude an objection someone might bring to this text and suppose that he married his sister, which was permissible given the circumstances (167). Speaking of women, it is remarkable that the genealogy mentions Noeman (4,21), Thobel's sister, next to coppersmiths and others. Women will play a crucial role here because of their sons' names, under which are deep meanings (168). You can get a sense of the importance of these details when we consider that Lamech confessed his sin (4,24), comparing his own crimes to those of Cain (169). But in his providential care, God has mercy on those who ask for forgiveness and confess their faults—just as we do in our church and just as is reflected in our lawcourts (169–171).

Seth's name, too, is important (172): it is a monument to God's favor on his mindset and his curse on Cain's fratricide. But Seth was not able to give his own son Enosh the natural favor of birthright. All the more remarkable, then, is the fact that as the text states, his name 'invokes the name of the Lord God' (4,26). This means that the true divine lineage is accomplished through the right use of free will, not the material benefits that a good family name can give you (172). In fact, placing stock in such things usually runs one into the ground with avarice (173). It would be better to practice almsgiving.

3.4.2 Making Names, Creating Memory

Chrysostom interprets *Naid*, the place where Cain goes after being condemned to wander the earth away from the presence of God (Gen 4,16), as 'tossing' (σάλος). Chrysostom places this word into a memorable glossing construction, 'of tossing and trembling' (τοῦ σάλου καὶ τοῦ τρόμου).²¹⁰ The Septuagint gives clues that this relates to Cain's spiritual condition, as it states that he will always be 'groaning' (στένων) and 'trembling' (τρέμων) (Gen 4,12–14). The onomastic tradition of 'tossing' thereby provides an emphasis on the physical condition to which Cain is subjected as part of his banishment from Eden. Chrysostom views this as a mnemonic device, as he states that this condition is not only 'a reminder' (ὑπόμνησις) to him but 'to all future generations'. *Naid*, after all, is across from Eden; Cain will never forget paradise lost.

Like Chrysostom, Eusebius of Emesa ultimately gives two words that gloss Cain's condition, which he reports as the readings of Theodotion and Symmachus, 'the one tossing about' (σαλευόμενος) and 'unstable' (ἀκατάστατον).²¹¹

210 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 20.1 (PG 53.167; FOC 82.36).

211 Eusebius of Emesa *apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad* 4,12 (GCS NF 22.168,10); *Cat.* 536 (TEG 2.30) and the Armenian (TEG 15.82).

Chrysostom gave *σάλος*, not the participial form, and he does not seem to have known Eusebius's *ἀκατάστατον*; it is more likely he draws from a common group witnessed by Philo, Didymus, and Eusebius of Caesarea who give the single word *σάλος*.²¹²

The way Chrysostom's 'tossing' fits into his wider discourse purposes becomes clear when focusing on the other exegetical traditions at work in *Homily 20 on Genesis*. Following the tragedy of Abel's murder, the *prooemium* emphasizes the knowledge 'in our nature' (τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ φύσει) of the natural law, 'our faculty of free will' (αὐτεξουσίους ἡμᾶς), and discernment (κατακρίνει) between good and evil, of which the primary ethical measurement is 'of our mindset' (γνώμης τῆς ἡμετέρας).²¹³ Natural law is a major theme in the *Homilies on Genesis*, and it extends beyond adoption of generic Stoic ethical categories and, for example, family law, and into his understanding of the development of human history, such as the arts, metal technologies, and sciences, mentioned in the pericope of Gen 4,19–22 in the present homily.²¹⁴ Actually, this homily is a remarkable convergence of the various dimensions in which the natural law functions as the creator's benevolent gift to ensure the preservation of the human race in the midst of what very well could have been collapse.

Exegetical traditions help Chrysostom magnify particular details which contribute to this aim. Having set the tone of minute study with his explanation of Naid, he urges his audience to look 'with detail' (μετὰ ἀκριβείας) at the next words, those of Gen 4,17 which describe Cain conceiving a son with his wife. 'Someone might say' that Scripture contradicts itself here, as there was no prior mention of a woman. This did not seem to be a problem for Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore, but Didymus knows it as a *zētēma*. Both Didymus and Chrysostom explain that Cain married a sister, polygamy justified due to ensure 'succession' of the human race.²¹⁵ The common points of explanation signify shared sources or mutual exchange. While this is not a report of the Rabbinic tradition of the twin sisters of Cain and Abel,²¹⁶ it is an interesting point of convergence

212 Philo, *Cherub*. 12 (PAO 1.172,25–173,1); Didymus, *In Gen.* 135,27 (SC 233.314); Eusebius of Caesarea, *Onom.* v' 724 (GCS NF 24.175); cf. Rogers, *Didymus the Blind*, 139 and Wutz, *Onomastica sacra*, 1:421.

213 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 20.1 (PG 53.166).

214 C.A. Bozinis, 'The Natural Law in John Chrysostom', in de Wet–Mayer (eds.), *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, 493–524, esp. 498–506.

215 Details in Chapter 8. The tradition does not appear to be known to Gennadius, *Coisl.* 127,32–33 (CCSG 15.131).

216 Explored admirably in Grypeou–Spurling, *The Book of Genesis in Late Antiquity*, Rabbinic reception 101–108, Christian reception, 121–127. On 123 n. 77 it is mentioned that like Didymus and Chrysostom, Diodore also knows the sister tradition, but I was unable to find the

over speculative Aggada-style on which Chrysostom could agree with Alexandrian sources, a surprising use of 'silent-scheme' exegesis that was eschewed at points by other Antiochenes (and, of course, at points, by Chrysostom himself).²¹⁷ Rhetorically, it heightens the importance of attending to specific details which might otherwise be easy to pass over, and so reinforces his overall argument with subtle but fixated points.

Further, Gen 4,19–22 unravels Cain's genealogy: emergent coppersmiths, metalworkers, cities, and the mention of women in the genealogy. Chrysostom identifies this pericope as focused on 'names' (ὀνόματα). Around quotations of the texts and small glosses, he crams the passage full of rhetorical cues for heightened attention and exegetical study: verbal expressions such as 'consider' (σκόπει), 'give me your attention' (συντείνάτέ μοι τὴν διάνοιαν) 'it has taught us' (ἐδίδαξεν ἡμᾶς), let us 'search out with clarity' (διερευνησαμένους μετὰ σαφηνείας); questions such as 'what is this novelty and paradox' (τί τὸ καινὸν καὶ παράδοξον); precision and meaning statements such as 'accuracy' (ἀκρίβειαν), 'benefit' (ὠφέλειαν), 'the hidden treasure' (τὸν ἐγκεκρυμμένον θησαυρόν), 'the tiny words' (τοῖς βραχέσι ῥήμασιν).²¹⁸ Some of these cues emerge in relation to the masterstroke biblical text on which his moral *paraenesis* will hinge, namely Gen 4,22–24 in which Lamech, who murdered Cain, confesses his faults. But the whole pericope of Gen 4,19–24 is placed in a dynamic between reading, call for attention, and brief explanation, thereby demonstrating his view that the tiny details like names contain the great treasures of spiritual wisdom. Notably, a *testimonium* source related to one used by Origen supports the lengthy exposition which ensues regarding the publication of one's wrongs.²¹⁹ With the support of Prov 18,17 and Isa 43,26, Chrysostom can conclude that 'just as in the case of human law courts,' Lamech declaring himself guilty mitigated his punishment and even placed him in the right.²²⁰ The discourse coordinates questions-and-answers, onomastic interpretation, exegetical tradition, and rhetorical cues for textual study.

But Chrysostom does not conclude on this tidy parallel between Lamech and his audience; he returns to the flow of the text and the importance of names, as

fragment to which the authors refer in Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs*, 156 where there is no fragment on 4,17, and in the *Collectio Coisliniana* (CCSG 15) there is likewise no fragment from Diodore on 4,17.

217 A. Kamesar, 'The Evaluation of the Narrative Aggada in Greek and Latin Patristic Literature', *JThS* 45.1 (1994), 37–71.

218 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 20.2 (PG 53.168; FOC 82.38).

219 *Ibid.*, 20.2–4 (PG 53.168–172; FOC 82.38–45). Details on the *testimonium* tradition in Chapter 8.

220 *Ibid.*, 20.4 (PG 53.171; FOC 82.43).

Adam and Eve have another son and name him Seth, the name being a 'monument' (μνήμην) to Abel and thus a reminder of the crimes of fratricide and envy.²²¹ Seth, in turn, bears a son and so too is his name significant. Enosh is 'hoped to invoke the name of the Lord God' (Gen 4,26). Following this exact example, Chrysostom says, 'a little while later' (κατὰ μικρὸν λοιπὸν) humans 'are taught' (παιδεύονται) to express of one's own 'proper gratitude' (οἰκείας εὐγνωμοσύνης) in regard to life circumstances through the names of our children.²²² Chrysostom thereby returns to the connection between the gift of natural law and the institutions and practices which compose society as we know it. By specifying Seth's importance further, he can correlate the intimate practice of family naming with the lineage of biblical virtue. For Seth contrasts to Cain in a crucial aspect. The latter, being firstborn, was bestowed honor 'from his nature' (ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως), but 'by the evil of his choice' (κακίᾳ προαιρέσεως) threw out this birthright. Seth, being the third born of Adam and Eve, did not have this privilege, so Chrysostom explains that 'the gratitude of his choice' (προαιρέσεως εὐγνωμοσύνην) is remarkable because it comes from a situation in which he did not possess 'from nature' (ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως) the same honor. Enoch, then, is a kind of patriarch of the family who 'calls upon the name' of the Lord and in this his line continues into the future.

The implications of this continuation are made clear in the closing *parae-sis*, namely that the godly lineage is the rooting out of vices like avarice and envy, Cain's sins.²²³ Chrysostom thereby compels his audience to reassess the meaning and function of a fundamental practice in the honor system of Late Antique Roman society. This is consistent with what we know from elsewhere in his work regarding his rejection of certain familial naming practices such as the recycling of names throughout multiple generations in order to avoid the impression that death was infecting this particular family.²²⁴ Scorning such practices as granting false consolation, he recommended instead the names of biblical heroes. At the same time, in *Homily 20 on Genesis* Chrysostom transforms the meaning of cognatic family lineage, on which Nathan has worked to show that in Late Antiquity there emerges a heightened importance.²²⁵ Here the very concept of bestowing a name is defamiliarized and reassessed in the

221 Ibid. (PG 53.172; FOC 82.45).

222 Ibid. (PG 53.172; FOC 82.46).

223 Ibid. 20.5 (PG 53.173).

224 V. Vuolanto, *Children and Asceticism in Late Antiquity. Continuity, Family Dynamics and the Rise of Christianity* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 173.

225 G. Nathan, *The Family in Late Antiquity. The Rise of Christianity and the Endurance of Tradition* (London: Routledge, 2000), 126.

light of how the name relates to the use of free choice in life. By using exegetical and onomastic tradition to root Christian virtue in the ancient practice of naming and draw out the role of natural law in the divine pedagogy, Chrysostom removes the image of family dynasty as a central element of power and the accumulation of honour and possession. Instead of accumulating wealth through what is given by nature, we should instead give away wealth in accordance with our perception of the natural good in order to accumulate virtue in the eyes of God.

4 Conclusion

Chrysostom's techniques and traditions for studying biblical language were remarkably diverse, attesting to the fluidity, crosspollination, and availability of exegetical traditions at his time. His handling of sources is eclectic, for he shows himself capable of using onomastic traditions that did not seem available to his predecessors Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa, and were instead favored by Didymus, Eusebius of Caesarea, Philo, and Origen. More remarkable, though, is that at several points, he gives similar interpretations to this latter group, with detailed correspondences, such as specific explanatory formulas and common text-citation traditions. For this, stand-out cases are his metaphorical–typological interpretation of the blessing of Jacob as image of Christ's salvific economy, his onomastic interpretations of Zarah and Phares as typology of Gentile Church and Jews, Naid as mnemonic device for Cain's wandering, and his understanding of the 'habit' of the bible's use of the word 'flesh'. In onomastic interpretations, he outright contradicted Theodore's restrictive exegesis of Zorobabel or Diodore's restrictive Christology. At the same time, he discussed grammatical points of theological consequence in ways that draw upon shared resources with Antiochene authors, such as the 'until' marker.

The tables presented in this chapter give the impression of a consistent and intentional exegetical practice guided by discernment of which traditions will help him discover a connection between the text and his audience's conception of the divine providence guiding human history and holding ethical actions to account. Particularly the practice of glossing words, immensely widespread throughout the *Homilies on Genesis*, was often performed with lexical tools in the background. What Chin observed about Augustine holds true for Chrysostom: 'In combination with his concentration on the instability of the biblical text, [his] glosses take on a greater importance: [he] can use the actual text to project an ideality of words and meanings that exists beyond the confines of the text but is nonetheless based upon it—an ideality that is superimposed on

the text by the act of reading'.²²⁶ Chrysostom demonstrates this projection in how he connects word-glosses or interpretations not just to an idealized *skopos* patterned throughout the whole discourse, but to non-literal images that substantiate and elaborate this *skopos*.

The clearest demonstration of his connection of linguistic commentary to particular discourse threads emerges from our case study of *Homily 20 on Genesis*. Since he had several other homilies on the topic of names in his Antiochene career (*Sermon 9 on Genesis*, *Homilies 1–2 on the Changing of Names*, *On the Beginning of Acts 1–3*), and given the pericope surrounding genealogical accounts in the biblical text (Gen 4–5), it is not surprising that he composed at least one *Genesis* homily almost entirely devoted to the meaning of names. Onomastic tradition, potential contradiction, questions-and-answers, application of exegetical traditions, and the creation of a mimetic relationship between the text and the audience all converge.

In this convergence, as already stated, Chrysostom stretched the boundaries of the Antiochene emphases on linguistic and contextual commentary. Using common Antiochene formulations and traditional identification points about which texts and problems needed commentary, Chrysostom often gave non-literal interpretations to serve his own purposes. This raises the question of the extent of his interaction with previous models and his profile in regard to his Antiochene exegetical heritage.

²²⁶ C.M. Chin, *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World*, Divinations (Philadelphia, PA: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 104.

PART 2

Engaging Exegetical Sources



It is the chief value of legend to mix up the centuries while preserving the sentiment; to see all ages in a sort of splendid foreshortening. That is the use of tradition: it telescopes history.

— G.K. CHESTERTON, *The Ballad of the White Horse*, VIII



John Chrysostom among the Antiochenes

From the view of the *Homilies on Genesis*, Chrysostom's preaching aims to relate patristic exegetical traditions to the *skopos* or *skopoi* of a discourse. He dialogues with previous models, above all the questions raised at particular Genesis texts, by revisionary modes of emphasis, selection, elision, and alteration. This eclectic and sometimes critical key enables him to find what is useful in a tradition for his own purposes. The degree of his freedom in regard to other exegetes may be explored further. Investigating the aesthetic experience of the interpreter John Chrysostom also opened up a window on the networks of shared exegetical knowledge in Late Antiquity. In the present chapter, I situate on a more systematic scale John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* in relation to the works on Genesis by Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore of Tarsus, with occasional reference to Antiochenes. Additionally, I consider parallels with Ephrem the Syrian, often considered an important figure in relation to Antiochene exegetes of the fourth-century. This chapter poses as a resource for concentrated cases in which a 'school' environment may undergird Antiochene exegetes, as their common knowledge of questions and answers is at times remarkably precise. Crucially, however, there are notable moments of disagreement and departure, particularly when Chrysostom is placed in relation to his teachers.

It is useful to recall that in Jerome's estimation, Chrysostom, like his mentor Diodore, was a follower (*sectator*) of Eusebius of Emesa.¹ However, Jerome did not specify further the relationship between these three Antiochenes. When it comes to influences on John Chrysostom's exegesis of the bible, most assessments, ancient and modern, reference Diodore and his *asceterium* as the source of Chrysostom's scriptural learning, leaving the impression that Jerome's mention of Eusebius was haphazard.² Eusebius's importance to later

1 Jerome, *De vir. inl.* 129 (TU 14/1.54,15–16): *Eusebii Emiseni Diodorique sectator*. See further discussion and contextualization of Jerome's witness to the Antiochene group in R.E. Winn, *Eusebius of Emesa. Church and Theology in the Mid-Fourth Century* (Washington, D.C.: CUA Press, 2011), 38–40.

2 Ancient: Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* 6.3.6–7 (GCS NF 1.314,7–12), where, actually, the 'training centers of Diodore and Karterius' (τὰ ἀσκητικὰ Διοδώρω καὶ Καρτερίῳ) are mentioned; this is the passage in which Socrates famously describes Diodore's exegesis as 'passing over the bare letter' (ψιλῶ τῷ γράμματι) and 'leaving aside their insightful meanings' (τὰς θεωρίας αὐτῶν ἐκτρεπόμενος); cf. Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.* 8.2.6 (GCS 50.350,18–22). Modern: Ch. Baur, *Johannes*

Antiochenes was overshadowed especially in 19th-century historical and theological research. While there are exceptions to this,³ the tendency was to position Chrysostom in relation to Theodore of Mopsuestia, who was viewed as the archetypal representative of the Antiochene school of proto-historical-critical biblical exegesis.⁴ Many scholars have rightly seen Chrysostom as a predecessor to Theodoret of Cyrus's moderate use of typological or allegorical interpretation, as opposed to Theodore's more restricted approach.⁵ These accounts, however, suffer from unwarranted historical periodization within the 'Antiochene school' and a narrow conception of the extent to which ancient Christian authors shared traditions of inquiry and explanation on the same biblical texts.⁶ In studies assessing Chrysostom as an exegete, the focus has therefore been less on critical examination of the contents of his biblical exegesis of specific texts in relation to others from his environment, and rather more on positioning in relation to other Antiochenes his formulaic stances on topics like scriptural inspiration, the relationship between the two testaments, or allegorical interpretation.⁷ While these approaches have substantiated some of Chrysostom's peculiar emphases regarding biblical interpretation and the-

Chrysostomus und seine Zeit, 2 vols. (Munich: M. Huebner, 1929–1930), 1/2:69–81; R. Leconte, 'L'ascetisme de Diodore', in *Mélanges bibliques rédigées en l'honneur de André Robert*, Travaux de l'Institut catholique de Paris 4 (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1957), 531–536; Schaublin, *Untersuchungen*, 43 rejects Jerome's testimony explicitly; J.N.D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth. The Story of John Chrysostom, Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (London: Duckworth, 1995), 19; Liebeschuetz, *Ambrose and John Chrysostom*, 118, 128. Palladius, John Chrysostom's biographer shortly after his life, is silent about Diodore, a fact stressed by Baur.

- 3 E. Schweizer, 'Diodor von Tarsus als Exeget', *ZNW* 40 (1941), 49 had already noticed that Diodore's exegesis was partially reliant on Eusebius of Emesa; Chase, *Chrysostom*, 2–9 reckons that Eusebius was a notable figure within the Syrian-Palestinian exegetical schools but erroneously states that 'his successors were almost completely indifferent to [his] textual criticism' (8).
- 4 Förster, *Chrysostomus*, 24–26; Ph. Hergenröther, *Die antiochenische Schule und ihre Bedeutung auf exegetischem Gebiete* (Würzburg: Stahel, 1866), 27–30; J.P. de Barjau, *L'école exégétique d'Antioche* (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1898), 40–42; R. Bultmann, *Die Exegese des Theodor von Mopsuestia* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984²).
- 5 Thus, De Barjau, *L'école exégétique d'Antioche*, 41–42: 'en exégèse, il porte encore l'empreinte profonde de l'enseignement de son maître (Théodore); il (Théodoret) est, à vrai dire, le dernier exégète d'Antioche. A ce titre, il nous paraît supérieur à Chrysostome ... Le sens caché est admis, le Cantique est expliqué au moyen de l'allégorie. En un mot, le mouvement de retraite s'accroît'; cf. Hidal, 'Exegesis in the Antiochene School', 562–564.
- 6 See ter Haar Romeny, 'Eusebius of Emesa', 127–128 who addresses the problem of periodization within the Antiochene school. We see, for instance, H. Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus als Exegeten* (Freiburg: Herder, 1880), 11, dividing the Antiochene school between early and late stages.
- 7 So, Hill, *Reading*, 29–31 (inspiration); 41–43 (Old/New Testaments); 151 (allegory); 175 (trini-

ology, the extent to which he was capable of addressing scholarly aspects of biblical study as developed by his predecessors remains unclear.

To illustrate the point from another angle, the recent study of Schor, an otherwise detailed account of the 'social network' of fourth-century Antioch, does not mention Eusebius of Emesa at all.⁸ Following ter Haar Romeny, Winn, and Liebeschuetz, balance must be restored to this picture.⁹ If we speak of Diodore as having taught Chrysostom, the evidence from the surviving biblical commentaries suggests that it is often at the hands of Eusebius that Diodore may have left his mark. Further, on the subject of exegetical influences in Antiochene authors, the intriguing question of the presence of Syrian traditions has not been much applied to John Chrysostom's exegesis.¹⁰ However, the work of Reuling and Grypeou–Spurling have found frequent points of contact between the underlying questions raised by Jewish exegetical traditions and John Chrysostom, opening an opportunity to specify further how the transmission of ideas

tarian theology). See for instance, Förster, *Chrysostomus*, 32–37 for inspiration and anthropomorphism; de Barjeau, *L'école exégétique d'Antioche*, 41 n. 2 with the citation of Chrysostom's definition of allegory in *Comm. Isa.* 5.3; cf. for the same approach, with reference to the same text (though erroneously referenced as 5.7), Bate, 'Technical Terms', 60.

- 8 A. Schor, 'Theodoret on the "School of Antioch": A Network Approach', *J ECS* 15.4 (2007), 517–562; *ibid.*, *Theodoret's People: Social Networks and Religious Conflict in Late Roman Syria*, TCH 48 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011). Schor may have neglected Eusebius of Emesa because Theodoret associates him with the error of Apollinarius, Theodoret, *Eran. dial.* 3 (ETTLINGER, 253,7).
- 9 Ter Haar Romeny, 'Eusebius of Emesa', 129; Winn, *Eusebius of Emesa*, 190; Liebeschuetz, 'How God Made the World', 250, which compares John Chrysostom and Eusebius of Emesa on the creation account.
- 10 Ter Haar Romeny, 'Eusebius of Emesa', 138 has shown that Ephrem and Eusebius of Emesa shared some exegetical questions-and-answers; Van Rompay, 'Antiochene Biblical Interpretation: Greek and Syriac', in Frishman–Van Rompay (eds.), *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation*, 103–123, cautions that Ephrem is distinct from Antiochenes with a greater openness to aggadic interpretation and methods resembling Targumic paraphrase (cf. Kamesar, 'Narrative Aggada'), further substantiated by E. Narinskaya, *Ephrem, a Jewish Sage. A Comparison of the Exegetical Writings of St. Ephrem the Syrian and Jewish Traditions*, STT 7 (Turnhout, 2010), 88–92. On Ephrem's relationship to these Jewish exegetical materials, see P. Féghali, 'Influence des Targums sur la pensée exégétique d'Ephrem?', *OCA* 229 (1984), 71–82 and more recently T. Kremer, *Mundus Primus. Die Geschichte der Welt und des Menschen von Adam bis Noach im Genesiskommentar Ephrāms des Syrers*, CSCO 641 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012) who demonstrate Ephrem's wide-ranging familiarity with a number of these Jewish traditions regarding the book of Genesis in particular. For attention to the literal method, Ephrem is classified as an Antiochene exegete by P. Yousif, 'Exegetical Principles of St Ephrem the Syrian', *StPatr* 18.4 (1983), 302.

occurred.¹¹ While it has long been noted that by sheer geographical and historical proximity Ephrem must be considered in conjunction with fourth-century Greek Antiochene exegetes,¹² only recently has it been taken seriously that their contents bear some formal similarities beyond the general concern for literal exegesis and the occasional willingness to find typological connections in the Old Testament.¹³ Extending this interest, Chrysostom may thereby be fruitfully placed in relation to the methods and ideas of Eusebius of Emesa and Ephrem the Syrian.

Already, the work of Van Rompay and ter Haar Romeny has raised the likelihood that Eusebius of Emesa, being bilingual in Syriac and Greek, mediated exegetical traditions shared with Syriac authors to Antiochenes such as Diodore.¹⁴ There are, of course, important differences between Eusebius of Emesa and Ephrem the Syrian, such as the latter's greater openness to Jewish aggada. The connections between these authors and their impact on later Antiochenes need further investigation. We cannot reconstruct the origins of the Antiochene exegetical school. Attempts to do so from the angle of Diodore's theology are bound by vague, piecemeal assertions from ancient historians or

11 H. Reuling, *After Eden. Church Fathers and Rabbis on Genesis 3:76–21*, JCPs 10 (Leiden: Brill, 2006); Grypeou–Spurling, *The Book of Genesis*.

12 For instance, Chase, *Chrysostom*, 8 and M. Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church. An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, trans. J.A. Hughes (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 59–63 places Eusebius of Emesa and Ephrem in a conception of the origins of the School of Antioch, or Syro-Palestinian Exegesis. Chrysostom himself may witness to this geographical proximity of Syriac-speaking Christians in *Ad pop.* 19.1 (PG 49.188). This passage is taken as such by D.G.K. Taylor, 'Bilingualism and Diglossia in Late Antique Syria and Mesopotamia', in J.N. Adams et al. (eds), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 304. Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places*, 139–141, makes the same kind of point, but from John Chrysostom, *De ss. martyr.* 1 (PG 50.646). In fact, in neither of these passages does Chrysostom say that these are Syriac speakers; this is inferred from their designation 'in the countryside' (ἐν τῇ χώρῃ).

13 Compare S. Hídal, *Interpretatio Syriaca. Die Kommentare des Heiligen Ephräm des Syrers zu Genesis und Exodus mit besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer auslegungsgeschichtlichen Stellung*, Coniectanea biblica 6 (Lund: Gleerup, 1974), 32 and ter Haar Romeny, 'Eusebius of Emesa', 129–130 with S. Muto, 'Early Syriac Hermeneutics', *The Harp* 11–12 (2012), 43–66, the latter viewing Ephrem's method as opposed to that of Greek Antiochenes albeit sharing similar cultural and theological concepts like the divine accommodation, see further S. Griffith, 'Syriac/Antiochene Exegesis in Saint Ephrem's Teaching Songs De Paradiso: The "Types of Paradise" in the "Treasury of Revelations"', in R.D. Miller (ed.), *Syriac and Antiochian Exegesis and Biblical Theology for the 3rd Millennium*, Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 6 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008), 27–52.

14 Van Rompay, 'Antiochene Biblical Interpretation', esp. 114–116; ter Haar Romeny, 'Eusebius of Emesa', esp. 138.

attempts at discerning connections between his theology and exegesis.¹⁵ But based on the surviving material from their biblical commentaries,¹⁶ we can detect aspects of how exegetical ideas seem to have been transmitted from ear-

- 15 Most historiography assumes that Diodore's *asceterium* was the breeding ground of distinctive Antiochene exegetical and Christological ideas. There is some support for this, e.g., Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.* 5.40 (GCS 5.348,1–4) offers the picture of Diodore and his fellow pro-Nicene bishop Flavian furnishing their pastors with anti-Arian arguments. But no specifics are given of what this equipment consisted, and Theodoret does not necessarily imply that orthodox centralization took place at the monastery in an exegetical-scholastic environment. Schor, 'Theodoret', 550–553 thereby risks an unwarranted inclusion of the theological activities of Meletius into Diodore's *asceterium*. Key to Schor's conception of the centralization of orthodoxy in Diodore's institution is Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.* 5.3 (GCS 5.279–280), but strictly speaking these passages concern the work of Meletius and Paulinus in Antioch itself, not in the allegedly secluded monastery of Diodore and Carterius mentioned by Socrates. For the orthodoxy of Diodore, see Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.* 7.9.6 (GCS 50.312,17–18). Again, this passage does not refer to Diodore's *asceterium* in the mountains surrounding Antioch, but to his church in Tarsus.

An excellent survey of fourth-century Antiochene Christology is still B. Drewery, 'Antiochien II. Die Bedeutung Antiochiens in der alten Kirche', *TRE* 3 (1978), 103–111. It is reasonable to assume a link between Diodore's theology and exegesis. This was influentially suggested by V. Ermoni, 'Diodore de Tarse et son rôle doctrinal', *Le Muséon* 20 (1901), 422–444 and later established by A. Grillmeier–H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart. Im Auftrage der Theologischen Fakultät*, 2 vols. (Würzburg: Echterverlag, 1951–1953), 1:135–145, esp. 138–140; the latter was followed by Greer, 'The Antiochene Christology', esp. 334–335 and S.-P. Bergjan, 'Die dogmatische Funktionalisierung der Exegese nach Theodoret van Cyrus', in J. van Oort–U. Wickert (eds.), *Christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992), 32–48. Yet the development of Diodore's place as an exegete of the bible regarding other Antiochenes remains obscure, as seen in J. Behr, 'Diodore of Tarsus and his Exegesis', in O. Wischmeyer (ed.), *Handbuch der Bibelhermeneutiken: Von Origenes bis zur Gegenwart* (Berlin–Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2016), 35–46. For Behr, Diodore's exegesis may be understood as a reaction to the emperor Julian's critique of the 'fabrication' of the Old Testament. This follows Thome, *Historia contra Mythos*, esp. 81–82 and 219–220. But Julian is only one side of the coin. Eusebius of Emesa as an inheritor of the Origenian Hexapla crisis is absent from these portraits.

Another unfruitful reference point is Chrysostom himself. Schor, 'Theodoret', 553 n. 141 asserts that John Chrysostom, *Laus Diod.* 3–4 (PG 52.763–766) recalls Diodore's scriptural habits. But it is unclear to what Schor is referring. No such habits are mentioned, not here nor anywhere in *Laus Diodori*. Most of the *encomium* is about Chrysostom wrestling with the fact that he has received praise from Diodore and the congregation: Diodore has compared him to John the Baptist. Chrysostom tries to apply the appellation back onto Diodore.

- 16 Many of the fragments from Antiochene commentators like Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore come from the *Collectio Coisliniana* or Type II of the *Genesis-catenae*. The redactors of these works sometimes abridged the fragments which they included, so caution and comparison with Procopius and the Armenian is required when using these traditions.

lier authors, how this exchange impacted Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis*, and what Chrysostom's perspective can afford us about the interrelationship between these authors.

We know that Chrysostom, to a much less degree than Diodore, witnessed Eusebius's Syriac readings of the book of Genesis, scattered throughout his *oeuvre*.¹⁷ This fact raises the question of what other aspects of Eusebian biblical commentary influenced or were shared with Chrysostom. Liebeschuetz also took up the question of Chrysostom's relation to Eusebius of Emesa in a comparison between their comments on the creation of the world. Of the 12 *Homilies on Genesis* studied, he finds some common interests in questions-and-answers.¹⁸ These findings pave the way for further comparison. Next to the Eusebian-Diodoran aspect, we may also pose the question of Chrysostom's relationship to Syrian biblical exegetical traditions. While Van Rompay and ter Haar Romeny have compared Ephrem with Eusebius of Emesa, it stands to reason that Chrysostom may also be a witness to Antiochene connections with Syriac traditions. Because much of Diodore's commentary is lost, we cannot presume to know precisely how ideas in Eusebius of Emesa or Ephrem, when we find them, arrived in Chrysostom. But a comparative investigation sheds light on the complex variety of sources in the Antiochene region which influenced Chrysostom's presentation of biblical exegetical content in the *Homilies on Genesis*.

In what follows, I show that Eusebius raised numerous exegetical problems that are found in Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis*. Some also occur in Diodore. Principally, these exegetical problems stem from variant readings, the description of natural phenomena or objects, and narrative coherence. It is important to view these agreements with the caveat that Chrysostom was capable of departing from and even disagreeing with Eusebius and Diodore. After demonstrating these points, I turn to aspects of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* that parallel those in the works by Ephrem.

1 Variant Readings

As already discussed, studying the bible through variant readings and translations was central to the methodology of Eusebius of Emesa. Diodore followed

17 Ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 202 in his *Sermons on Genesis*; 405 in his *Homilies on Matthew*; 319–322 in his *Homilies on 11 Corinthians*; 222–226 in his *Homilies on Hebrews*.

18 Liebeschuetz, 'How God made the World', 249–250.

him closely on many of these points. For John Chrysostom's part, variant readings of the Greek bible play a small role in the *Homilies on Genesis* and his wider interpretation of the book of Genesis. Hill and Chase have slightly underestimated Chrysostom on this subject. The former counts only one case; the latter states that variant readings were 'out of place for [Chrysostom's study of] the Septuagint'.¹⁹ This picture is worth correcting, as variant readings are not entirely out of place from the vantage point of his exegesis of Genesis, especially when taken with the onomastic interpretations detailed in Chapter 4. The readings offered by Chrysostom are also found in the commentaries of Eusebius and Diodore. I present the readings in Table 4 below. In Columns 1 and 2 are the LXX Genesis text concerned. In Column 3 I provide the variant reading presented by Chrysostom. In parentheses I include the way he references this variant or the source he suggests. In Columns 3 and 4 I give the same thing for Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore. The footnotes in Column 1 provide the references to the works of John Chrysostom, Eusebius, and Diodore that occur in the corresponding row. In this table I have included two variants to the Genesis text that Chrysostom gives elsewhere in his *oeuvre* (*ad* 4,4 and 22,12)

When referencing a variant text, John Chrysostom is inaccurate in his attribution of sources: where Eusebius references Theodotion, Chrysostom the Syrian; where Eusebius references the Hebrew, Chrysostom a gloss; where Eusebius and Diodore attribute 'once' to Symmachus and Theodotion, Chrysostom to the generic 'another interpreter'.²⁰ Chrysostom is relying on the resources of his Antiochene exegetical culture in a limited way to draw out the mimetic value of the text: 'Another interpreter' helps him achieve a twofold argument *vis-à-vis* the creation of woman, namely that asceticism belongs to the aboriginal human condition, and that men and women are connatural; 'they say in Hebrew' helps him express that the word 'loins' may be interpreted as a genital organ and thus referencing a bizarre, ancient custom that conveyed honour. While his references are inaccurate, we note that in three cases, Chrysostom's provision of the actual variant terminology remains close to that found

19 Hill, *Reading*, 68–69; Chase, *Chrysostom*, 89.

20 See for example Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 1.6 (GCS NF 2.12,2–3): "Ὅπερ ἕτεροι τῶν ἐρμηνέων, σαφέστερον τὸν νοῦν ἐκδιδόντες, εἰρήκασιν, citing Aquila's version of Gen 1.1. For explorations of a parallel phenomenon, see R. Ceulemans, 'Readings Attributed to "οἱ περὶ α' and/or σ"' by Theodoret of Cyrrhus', in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Helsinki, 2010*, SOS 59 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 473–498; *ibid.*, 'Readings Attributed to "οἱ περὶ (τὸν) Ἀκύλαν and/or (τὸν) Σύμμαχον" by Greek Christian Scribes and Authors', *Semitica et Classica* 4 (2011), 73–88.

TABLE 4 Explicitly mentioned variant readings in the *Homilies on Genesis*

Genesis	Septuagint reading	Chrysostom's variant	Eusebius	Diodore
2,23 ^a	This now τοῦτο νῦν	Once ἅπαξ (‘Another interpreter’ Ἐτερος τις ἐρμηνευτής)	Once ἅπαξ (Σ, Θ)	Once ἅπαξ (Σ, Θ)
4,4 ^b	He saw ἐπείδεν	He set aflame ἐνεπύρισεν (Σύρ.)	He set aflame ἐνεπύρισεν (Θ)	
6,6 ^c	He regretted ἐνεθυμήθη	He reconsidered μετεμελήθη (ἀντί τοῦ)	He reconsidered μετεμελήθη (Ἐβ., ἀλλαχοῦ)	He reconsidered μετεμελήθη (Α)
22,12 ^d	Now I have known νῦν ἔγνων	Now you have known νῦν ἐγνώρισας (Σύρ.)	Now you have shown νῦν ἔδειξας (Σύρ)	He knew ἐγνώρισας (ἀντί τοῦ)
24,2 ^e	Thigh μηρόν	Loin ὀσφύν (It says in the Hebrew ἐν τῇ Ἑβρα- ῖδι φασίν)	The reproductive organ / thigh τὸ τεκνοποιὸν ὄργανον / μόριον (Ἐβ., Σύρ.)	The child-making organ τὸ παιδογόνον ὄργανον (Ἐβ., Σύρ.)

- a John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 15.3 (PG 53.122–123; FOC 74.201); Eusebius of Emesa *apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad 2,23* (GCS NF 22.116,140), cf. *Comm. Gen.* 18 (TEG 15.56); Diodore, *Coisl.* 100,11–12 (CCSG 15.103).
- b John Chrysostom, *In ep. ad Heb. hom.* 22 (EP 7.251,10–13); Eusebius of Emesa *apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad 4,2–11* (GCS NF 22.162–163,18–19), cf. *Comm. Gen.* 27 (TEG 15.76).
- c John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 22.5 (PG 53.192; FOC 82.79–80); Eusebius of Emesa *apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gn. ad 6,6* (GCS NF 22.191,5); cf. *Comm. Gen.* 43 (TEG 15.90); Diodore, *Coisl.* 145,2 (CCSG 15.145).
- d John Chrysostom, *In ep. ii ad Cor. hom.* 3 (EP 3.44); Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 1267,1 (TEG 3.229), cf. *apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad 22,1–19* (GCS NF 22.296,77), *Comm. Gen.* 79 (TEG 15.132).
- e John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 48.2 (PG 54.436; FOC 87.29); Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 1305,1–2 (TEG 3.252), *apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad 24,2–67* (GCS NF 22.302,1–2), Greek versus Hebrew and Syrian; cf. *Comm. Gen.* 83a (TEG 15.134), Hebrew versus Greek; Diodore, *Coisl.* 208,3–4 (CCSG 15.204).

in Eusebius and in some cases Diodore. But knowing what we do of Eusebius's influence on Diodore, we can state that Eusebius's commentary signaled points that may be discussed based on variant readings. Yet it must be stressed that Chrysostom uses these readings in ways that deviate from Eusebius and Diodore, and these deviations are illustrative of Chrysostom's complex standing in relation to Antiochene sources.

Consider the explanation of Gen 24,2. Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore explain the 'loin' (LXX, μηρόν) as 'the male genital organ' or the 'reproductive organ'. This passage concerns the question of what, exactly, is the object which Abraham's servant is demanded to hold in making an oath to his master—Abraham's thigh, or his genital organ? Like Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore, Chrysostom knows that he needs to clarify this point. But in answering, he gives a different word than Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore, found in some manuscripts to be a Hexaplaric reading.²¹ However, his reading, 'loin' (ὀσφύν), means the same thing as expressed by the lengthier formulations of his predecessors, that is, the genital organ; there is no substantial difference in their explanations apart from their linguistic resources. Ter Haar Romeny and Kamesar have suggested that this subtle difference is likely due to a shared exegetical tradition.²² An axiomatic definition of the term as 'generation' found in *Ezekiel-scholia* attributed to Origen supports this notion.²³ Based on the discussions of Ephrem, Eusebius of Emesa, and Diodore, the basic question seems to have concerned whether the oath referenced Abraham's progeny or his covenant with God, represented by his circumcised genital organ.²⁴ Chrysostom's knowledge of the word ὀσφύν as 'what they say in Hebrew' reflects the references given by Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore, 'the Hebrew and the Syrian' (ὁ Ἑβραῖος καὶ ὁ Σύρος). Chrysostom does not engage much the question of whether the oath refers to progeny or covenant, though he seems to prefer the latter as he describes it as a custom of men of ancient times. Interestingly, while in Diodore this text could serve as a sign that God would become incarnate from the seed of Abraham,²⁵ Chrysostom does not use this opportunity to

21 *Hexapla* ad loc. (FIELD, I:38bn. 2). Μηρός was likely an intelligible term to Greek hearers in Late Antiquity, but it did not connote the male reproductive organ as did the underlying Hebrew לֵךְ. Kamesar, *Jerome*, 155 n. 206 notes that Chrysostom's ὀσφύν may reflect him 'grafting' a Hebrew interpretation onto the Peshitta, cf. ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 342.

22 Ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 342; Kamesar, *Jerome*, 154–155.

23 Origen, *Sel. in Ez.* 1,26 (PG 13.769d): 'For loin is a symbol of generation' (ὀσφὺς γὰρ γεννήσεως σύμβολον).

24 Like Ephrem, *Comm. Gen.* 21.2.1 (CSCO 152.85,6), Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa note that this Hebrew term may be understood as less honorable, מְבוֹשָׁתִּים. In Procopius and the *catena*, Eusebius's terminology is σεμνότερον; the Armenian is 'more honestly' or 'more decently' (սարկեղանաղիւն). For further discussion and reception of this theme see ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 340–341 and S.P. Brock, 'Genesis 22 in Syriac Tradition', in P. Casetti et al. (eds.), *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy. Études Bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60^e anniversaire*, OBO 38 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 1–30.

25 Diodore, *Coisl.* 208,7–8 (CCSG 15.204): 'the coming incarnation of God' (μέλλειν σαρκουῖσθαι τὸν θεόν).

develop a typological non-literal meaning. As explored in the previous chapter, he relates this alternate reading to the ‘meaning [σκοπὸν] of the righteous man[’s story]’.²⁶ This particular *skopos* is that the ancients made alliances based not on outward materiality—after all, Abraham was an exile by faith—but on ‘the beauty of the soul’ (τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ κάλλος).

He does identify a typological reading based on a Genesis-text variant, however, in another case. Citing the Symmachus-Theodotion variant ‘once’ (Gen 2,23), Chrysostom connects to this episode the text of 1 Cor 11,8–9 to substantiate that man is not independent of woman in procreating. What transpired in the Genesis narrative needs explanation because the reader is faced with the bizarre idea that the woman was created from Adam’s rib. Via the variant, Adam’s remarks are made to indicate that it only happened ‘this once’. For Chrysostom, this implies that Adam understood that in the future, the procreation of humans will occur through a different means, namely their cooperation. However, Chrysostom goes on, how could Adam know about the New Testament principle of co-creation? Chrysostom therefore explains that Adam spoke prophetically. The variant reading has the explicit purpose of clarifying a bizarre Old Testament text in light of the New. It serves Chrysostom’s ascetic-Antiochene theology, as sexual intercourse is made to take place after the fall, as a result of sin, a departure from man’s original glorious condition. The same variant is used in an entirely different way elsewhere in Chrysostom’s works. In an instruction likely given in Antioch, Chrysostom reprises the ‘once’ reading to argue that it ‘hints’ (ἀνιπτόμενος) at the creation of the Church from the blood and water which flowed from the side of the pierced Christ on the cross (John 19,34).²⁷ In what survives of their commentaries, Diodore and Eusebius do not mention either of these interpretations, the latter a common typological interpretation in Late Antique Christian authors.²⁸

These two cases, while subtle, are richly illustrative. They concern a characteristic methodological feature of Antiochenes Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa, namely the provision of variants to clarify bizarre and difficult aspects of the Septuagint. Chrysostom’s resources for explaining the genital organ difficulty in Gen 24,2 do not appear to have derived directly from his predecessors, yet it is noteworthy that all three knew to bring up the variant reading here to clarify the perhaps embarrassing point in the text. More interesting is that, like the Gen 2,24 variant, all three exegetes ascribe slightly different regis-

26 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 48.2 (PG 54.437).

27 John Chrysostom, *Or. Cat.* 3.17–18 (SC 50.161,9–13).

28 See J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum futuri. Études sur les origines de la typologie biblique*, ThHist (Paris: Beauchesne, 1997²), 37–44, esp. 38–39 for Methodius.

ters to its importance. It cannot be said that one exegete appears more or less concerned with non-literal readings; they simply argue for such readings at different points. Common Antiochene resources to reference variant readings in the Genesis text, which appear to be pioneered, signaled, or collected through Eusebius, could thereby be used in flexible ways.

2 Describing Natural Phenomena or Objects in the Bible

Eusebius's impact extended beyond rendering accessible to later Antiochene authors biblical exegetical questions-and-answers based on Semitic resources. His *Commentary on Genesis* also contained many practical explanations to some confusing physical features depicted in the text, many concentrated in the creation account. Chrysostom knows many of the discussions current in Antiochene authors and can reprise specific points of terminology used to address them. Eusebius of Emesa presages Chrysostom regarding many of these.

2.1 'Placing' the Stars

A first example concerns the placing of the stars in the heavens (Gen 1,17). This text famously inspired Origen to deal with the problem of astrological fatalism popularized by the Stoics.²⁹ In the hands of the Antiochenes, similar

29 Origen, *Comm. Gen. III apud Philoc.* 14.1–2 (SC 302.406–408), discussion in Martens, *Origen*, 32–33 and Harl, *La Genèse*, 92–93. Origen was concerned with how the stars are placed in the heavens 'for commanding' (εἰς ἀρχάς) day and night. This scientific phenomenon is ultimately explained with an appeal to his conception of metaphysical 'rulers', which he justifies with a reference to Col 1,16, where the same plural term is used (ἀρχαί). For a survey of how Greek Christian authors in Late Antiquity confronted the problems of astrological fatalism, see book II of E. Amand de Mendieta, *Fatalisme et liberté dans l'antiquité grecque. Recherches sur la survivance de l'argumentation morale antifataliste de Carnéade chez les philosophes grecs et les théologiens chrétiens des quatre premiers siècles* (Leuven: Peeters, 1945), with a synopsis on 191–194, and A. Scott, *Origen and the Life of the Stars: A History of an Idea*, OECs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 97; 104–105; 136. This theme, of course, was not limited to Origen, but was dealt with extensively in works such as Diodore's treatise 'Against Destiny' (κατὰ εἰμαρμένης). Part of the latter is preserved in Diodore *apud* Photius, *Bibl.* 223 (208–220) (HENRY, IV:8–48). This text is discussed in Ch. Schäublin, 'Zu Diodors von Tarsos Schrift gegen die Astrologie (Phot. Bibl. Cod. 223)', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 123.1 (1989), 51–67; U. Possek, 'Bardaisan's Influence on Late Antique Christianity', *Hugoye* 21.1 (2018), 91–93 provides important orientation for Diodore's writing in relation to Bardaisan's *Book of the Laws*. For astrology in Edessa and its possible influence on Eusebius of Emesa, see R. Hennings, 'Eusebius von Emesa und die Juden', *ZAC* 5 (2001), 240–260, esp., 242 n. 18.

alarms were sounded, and it was addressed through a semantic study of the word ‘he placed’ (ἔθετο) in the text of Gen 1,17.³⁰ Chrysostom’s handling of this word has three dimensions. First, he wishes to avoid the notion that it could be understood as ‘fixed’ (ἔπηξεν).³¹ His reasoning as to why leads to the second aspect. The stars are clearly not fixed, in Chrysostom’s mind, because they are ‘traversing a mighty span in the twinkling of an eye’ (ἐν μιᾷ ῥοπῇ πολὺ διάστημα διατρέχοντες).³² Further, Chrysostom tells, the Septuagint is consistent with this sense, as when God ‘placed’ man in the garden (Gen 2,15)—clearly a dynamic sense, he believes. Third, in conclusion, Chrysostom arrives at an alternative gloss. The stars were ‘instead, directed to be there’ (ἀντὶ τοῦ, προσέταξεν).

We find that other Antiochenes addressed Chrysostom’s problem in similar terminology. Eusebius of Emesa, Diodore, and Theodore agree that ‘he placed’ in Gen 1,17 needs to be glossed. Each denies that it means ‘fixed’, giving variations on the term πῆγνυμι, the same term found in John Chrysostom.³³ Then, these three authors explain that the term must signify some sense of motion (κινεῖσθαι). As a comparative reference, they substantiate their argument by citing Gen 2,15, the text given in Chrysostom which uses the same aorist form of the verb ‘to place’. None of these exegetes, seem to offer Chrysostom’s gloss to the term, ‘directed it to be there’ (προσέταξεν). Notably, however, Eusebius of Emesa shares with Chrysostom an explanation of the movement of these stars. Where Chrysostom explains the movement of the stars ‘traversing a distance’ (διάστημα διατρέχοντες). Eusebius has the stars ‘running across a distance’ (τρέχουσιν διαστήματι).³⁴ Diodore, on the other hand, says that the stars ‘made their way above the surface’ (ὁδεύοντες τὴν ἄνω πορείαν).³⁵ Based on the surviving evidence, Chrysostom’s explanation of the phenomenon has many aspects in common with Theodore and Diodore but resembles most closely the terminology of Eusebius of Emesa. Intriguingly, Eusebius knows this problem as a

30 Diodore, *Coisl.* 52^{bis},5 (CCSG 15.51): states explicitly that this text may ‘introduce a foreign doctrine to the church’ (δόγμα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐθνικὸν ἐπεισάγων).

31 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 6.5 (PG 53.59).

32 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 6.5 (PG 53.59; trans. Hill, FOC 73.85).

33 Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 106 (TEG 1.85): οὐ πέπηγται, confirmed by the Armenian, *Comm. Gen.* 8e (TEG 15.38) եթէ բեւեռեալ յերկի; Diodore, *Coisl.* 52,7 (CCSG 15.51): οὐχὶ πῆξας; Theodore, *Cat.* 104,4 (TEG 1.83): οὐχ ὡς πεπηγότα, cf. the Theodore fragment in Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad* 1,14 (GCS NF 22.49,117): οὐκ ἀντὶ τοῦ «ἔπηξεν».

34 Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 105,1–2 (TEG 1.85). The reading is confirmed by the Armenian, *Comm. Gen.* 8d (TEG 15.38): a ‘course’ (ընթացս) beneath the heaven is made at an ‘interval’ (եռազոյն) of distance from it. A slightly different form is witnessed by Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad* 1,14 (GCS NF 22.48,106–107), where the verb is ‘they are born [across]’ (φέρονται).

35 Diodore, *Coisl.* 52^{bis},10 (CCSG 15.51).

zētēma.³⁶ It is possible that he originated it in the fashion of Origen as a means of dealing with Greek doctrines of astrological fatalism, as Gounelle has point out in particular the idea that creation is ‘self-constituting’ (αὐτόματα).³⁷ We cannot be certain the role Origen himself plays in the Antiochene development of this exegetical tradition. But for our purposes, this case suffices to show that Eusebius of Emesa produced explanations that are followed closely by Diodore, Theodore, and Chrysostom; the precise knowledge of this tradition in all four authors is indicative of a scholastic context, and Chrysostom was capable of bringing in other resources to meet the challenge, seen in his provision of the gloss ‘he directed it to be there’, consistent with the wider apologetic aim of denying fate and upholding the creative providence of the biblical God.

2.2 *The ‘Spirit’ of God*

Another physical phenomenon in the biblical text that carried considerable weight for Greek Christian authors was the description in Gen 1,2 that ‘the spirit of God hovered over the waters’. Liebeschuetz already noted the common ground of Eusebius of Emesa and John Chrysostom on this point, but further comparative analysis illuminates the complexity of Chrysostom’s handling of this tradition.³⁸ Commenting on this ‘spirit’ in his *Homily 3 on Genesis*, Chrysostom asks, ‘What does this word mean?’³⁹ He explains it with the following three ideas: a kind of living energy (ἐνέργειά τις ζωτική); movement (κινούμενον); an active capacity (δύναμιν). We find these elements in the famous explanation of Gen 1,2 by Eusebius of Emesa, but in slightly different form. For the Emesene, the ‘spirit’ is an active power (τὴν ἐνεργή δύναμιν) which warms the waters,⁴⁰ and it ‘moves to create life’ (κινεῖν πρὸς ζωογονίαν).⁴¹ Eusebius of Emesa’s explanation involved other interesting elements based on the Syriac language, aspects of which gained a wide use among Christian exegetes from Basil and Augustine to Ishodad of Merv who referenced ‘the Syrian’ in their own exegesis of this text.⁴² Notably, all of Chrysostom’s elements are in some

36 Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 107,1 (TEG 1.85): ζητείται; *apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad* 1,14 (GCS NF 22.48,106), ζητητέον; *Comm. Gen.* 8a (TEG 15.38): ἰσύνῃη.

37 R. Gounelle, ‘«Il a placé sa tente dans le soleil» chez les écrivains ecclésiastiques des cinq premiers siècles’, in *Le psautier chez les Pères*, CBP 4 (Strasbourg: Centre d’Analyse et de Documentation patristiques, 1994), 217–220.

38 Liebeschuetz, ‘How God made the World’, 249.

39 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 3.1 (PG 53.33): Τί βούλεται τὸ εἰρημένον.

40 Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 27 (TEG 1.21).

41 *Apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad* 1,2 (GCS NF 22.17,93–94), confirmed by *Comm. Gen.* 5a (TEG 15.32): Ὡρῶδῃη ... Ὡρῶδῃη.

42 J.-R. Pouchet, ‘Les rapports de Basile de Césarée avec Diodore de Tarse’, *Bulletin de lit-*

form present in Diodore, so the precise transmission of this tradition into the hands of Chrysostom is not clear, but Eusebius's priority is consistent with our previous example.⁴³

2.3 *The Serpent as 'Prudent'*

A third case emerges from the description of the serpent's apparent intelligence in Gen 3,1. The Greek text describes this creature as 'prudent' (φρόνιμον), which implied to readers some form of rational capacity inherent to what should otherwise be an irrational creature. This description thereby appeared contrary

térature ecclésiastique 87 (1986) 243–272. suggested that Diodore was Basil's source, but L. Van Rompay, 'L'informateur Syrien de Basile de Césarée. A propos de Genèse 1,2', *OCP* 58 (1992), 245–251, showed that the explanation originated with Eusebius of Emesa; see further ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 180–182. For its reception in Syrian tradition, see T. Jansma, "And the Spirit of God Moved upon the Face of the Waters". Some Remarks on the Syro-Hexaplaric Reading of Gen. 1 2', *VT* 20 (1970), 16–24. and A. Guillaumont, 'Genèse 1, 1–2 selon les commentateurs syriaques', in *In Principio. Interprétations des premiers versets de la Genèse*, EAA 38 (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1973), 115–132, esp. 126–131; Alexandre, *Le commencement*, 85–87 and A. Tarabochia Canavero, *Esegesi biblica e cosmologia. Note sull'interpretazione patristica e medioevale di Genesi 1, 2*. Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1981) for synthetic pictures including Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome.

- 43 Diodore, *Coisl.* 32,10–14 (CCSG 15,32): 'To beget life ... for the activity is called "spirit" ... moving' (ζωογενεῖν ... λέγεται γὰρ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια ... κινῶν); cf. Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 2.6 (GCS NF 2,31,17) 'a certain lively capacity ... lifebegetting ... from the creative power of the Holy Spirit' (ζωτικὴν τινα δύναμιν ... ζωγονίαν ... τῆς δημιουργικῆς ἐνεργείας τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον). Basil does not mention movement with the term κινεῖν as Eusebius, Diodore, and Chrysostom. The terminology at stake here was widespread beyond the confines of fourth-century biblical exegetes. See Theophilus, *Ad Aut.* 2.13 (GRANT, 48): εἰς ζωογόνῃσιν ... διΐκινούμενον. Beyond this, we also see it used in Aristotelian commentary. For instance, the phenomenon of heat is discussed in Aristophanes Grammaticus, *Excerpt de nat.* 1.67 (CAG SUPP. 1.119), where heat is said to have 'a certain lively capacity' (ζωτικὴν τινα δύναμιν); cf. Plato, *Phaedo* 105c and Aristotle, *De Anima* I, 5, 411b. A comparable discussion concerned the notion that the blood was the 'life-force' of the soul. It is allegorized in Origen, *Hom. in Ps.* XXXVI 3.4 (GCS NF 19,144,4–5): 'His blood flows; for his lively capacity was destroyed' (τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ῥεῖ· ἀπώλετο γὰρ ἡ ζωτικὴ δύναμις αὐτοῦ). The expression ἡ ζωτικὴ δύναμις is used in reference to blood and soul in Galen, *De diff. puls.* 3.2 (CGOA 8.645,17–18). Neopythagorean and Middle platonic discussions of the soul use it as well, e.g., Timaeus Locrus, *De nat. mund.* 52, 219d1 (PhAnt 24.140), with comparable elements in Gregory of Nyssa, *Opif.* 15; 24 (PG 44.144–145; 177) and Didymus, *In Gen.* 130 (SC 233.302,4–5). For discussion of these anthropological expressions in ancient authors, see J.P. Cavaros, 'Relation of the Body and Soul in the Thought of Gregory of Nyssa', in H. Dörrie et al. (eds.), *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie: Zweites internationales Kolloquium über Gregor von Nyssa* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 66 n. 22 and D.T. Runia, *Philo and the Church Fathers: A Collection of Papers*, SVC 32 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 68.

to all logic and experience, a fact on which Celsus and Julian capitalized. The latter, for instance, posed the question of which dialect did the serpent speak to Eve, noting the scene's striking similarity to Greek myth.⁴⁴ As some gnostic and Manichaean groups, Julian on the other hand built the idea that the serpent was the hero of the story, sharing with humanity what the creator jealously withheld, namely rational intelligence.⁴⁵

Chrysostom acknowledges a background of debate and controversy about this text, using the terminology of *aporia* and *zētēma* to wonder whether the serpent could speak of its own accord.⁴⁶ Certainly not, Chrysostom says. By his own envy, the devil himself 'used the serpent for a fitting instrument' (ἐπιτηδείῳ ὀργάνῳ ἐχρήσατο). The serpent is the bait for the devil's 'plot' (ἐπιβουλῆς) to cause the human race to falter; by this 'instrument' the devil may cast the 'hook of his own deceit' (δέλεαρ τῆς οἰκείας ἀπάτης). Eusebius of Emesa reports these formulations in the context of the opinion of 'some others say' (τινὲς δὲ λέγουσιν).⁴⁷ To these *τινες*, he attributes the notion that the serpent was made as a 'fitting instrument' (ἐπιτήδειον αὐτὸν ὄργανον) for the devil to communicate to Eve with human language; by this instrument the devil can enact his 'deceit' (ἀπάτην) and the broader 'plot' (ἐπιβουλὴν) of ruining the human race. Diodore and Theodore also knew some of these formulations in their own handling of similarly stated objections to the paradise narrative.⁴⁸ As in

44 Julian, *C. Gal.* fr. 15 [Mas] *apud* Cyril of Alexandria, *C. Jul.* 3.20.3–6 (GCS NF 20.189): 'We shall say that the serpent speaking to Eve used which dialect [διαλέκτῳ]? And what difference are these things from the myths fabricated [πεπλασμένων μύθων] by the Greeks?' Julian's critique of the Mosaic account of the fall of man is studied by Ch. Riedweg, 'Mythos mit geheimem Sinn oder reine Blasphemie?: Julian über die mosaische Erzählung vom Sündenfall („Contra Galilaeos“ fr. 17.10–12 Masaracchia)', in A. Kolde et al. (eds), *Κορυφαῖο ἀνδρῖ. Mélanges offerts à André Hurst* (Geneva: Droz, 2005), 367–375 and M.-O. Boulnois, 'Genèse 2–3: Mythe ou vérité? Un sujet de polémique entre païens et chrétiens dans le Contre Julien de Cyrille d'Alexandrie', *REAug* 54 (2008), 111–133, esp. 112. According to Origen, *C. Cels.* 4.38 (SVC 54.255,5–7), Celsus had ridiculed the notion that the snake could so easily counteract the judgements of God, citing this as one of his proofs that Jewish texts are not capable of being allegorized, discussed in Guinot, 'Muthos', 180–190.

45 Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 234–250; Morlet, 'Pourquoi', 139–140.

46 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 16.2 (PG 53.127): 'Someone might inquire here and might seek to learn ...' (διαπορήσειεν ἄν τις, καὶ μαθεῖν ζητήσειεν ...).

47 Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 320.8, 11, 16 (TEG 1.217–218), these readings are confirmed by *apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad* 3.1 (GCS NF 22.119,56–61).

48 Diodore, *Coisl.* 103.2–3 (CCSG 15.106): 'the fitting organ for his deceit' (τὸ πρὸς ἀπάτην ἐπιτήδειον ὄργανον). The tradition is also witnessed in the *Apocryphon of John*. Theodore *apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad* 3.1 (GCS NF 22.122,148–149), where the serpent is spoken 'figuratively' (τροπικῶς) of the devil who communicated 'apart from perceptible voice' (ἄνευ φωνῆς αἰσθητῆς). For Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Aut.* 2.28 (GRANT, 70), the devil's action

Chrysostom, the connected notions of ‘plot’, ‘deceit’, and ‘instrument’ form a response to the question whether the serpent, an irrational animal, possessed an attribute that fundamentally signals rationality, namely speech. Beyond Julian who raised this objection, who are these *τινες* underlying the exegetical plan of John Chrysostom and his exegetical grandfather?

Several contemporaries of Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore share the same elements enumerated above, complicating the picture. In his work *That God is not the Author of Evils*, Basil of Caesarea mentions ‘the question concerning the devil’ (τὸ περὶ τοῦ διαβόλου ζήτημα) and his temptation of the human beings in paradise.⁴⁹ Referring to the serpent as the devil’s ‘instrument’ (ὄργανον), he also uses the same expression found in Chrysostom, ‘the hook of deceit’ (ἀπάτης τὸ δέλεαρ).⁵⁰ Finally, Basil concludes this work by mentioning that the fruit of eternal life is prohibited to us because of ‘the plot’ (ἐπιβουλὴν) of the serpent.⁵¹

The polemical context of the fourth-century proliferation of this text-web revolves around a reaction to Julian but brings other elements into its strings. In framing an objection from his staged Manichaean interlocutor, Titus of Bostra witnesses the view that the prohibition to eat from the tree in the garden was a divine ‘plot’ (ἐπιβουλὴν) against man.⁵² Our authors cited above, then, may be trying to reverse the accusation, placing the onus of ‘envy’ and ‘plot’ onto who is in their opinion the real culprit of the story, namely the devil. As a later anonymous *Anti-Jewish Dialogue* attests, ascribing the ‘plot’ (ἐπιβουλὴν) to the devil also resolves the problem addressed in Chrysostom and Eusebius of Emesa, namely that an irrational animal could possess speech.⁵³ This witness further complicates the question of the identity of Eusebius’s *τινες*, as the author of the anonymous dialogue ascribes the objection concerning the speech of the serpent (among others) to ‘some Celsians, Porphyryians, and Julianians’⁵⁴—pagan detractors known to have written works critiquing the paradise narrative.⁵⁵ However, we may bear in mind that Eusebius of Emesa invokes his *τινες*, who as seen share formulations with Chrysostom, not as polemical interlocutors but positive sources of explanation; the ideas of ‘some people’ provide clar-

is a seduction to ‘error’ (πλάνη), idolatry. See discussion in Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 235 and Morlet, ‘Un nouveau témoignage’, 160.

49 Basil of Caesarea, *Quod deus* 8 (PG 31.345d).

50 Ibid., 9 (PG 31.348c–d).

51 Ibid., 10 (PG 31.353a).

52 Titus of Bostra, *C. Man.* 3.7.9 (CCSG 82.251).

53 *Dial. An.* 1.178–202 (CCSG 30.8). The suggested date of the text is the sixth-century.

54 Ibid., Κελσοί τινες καὶ Ἰουλιανοὶ καὶ Πορφύριοι.

55 As suggested by Morlet, ‘Un nouveau témoignage’, 157–161.

ity to well-known objections to the biblical text. This suggests that Eusebius of Emesa and Chrysostom were likely drawing upon a responsive work, such as Diodore's *Against the Manichaeans*, George of Laodicea's work by the same name, or Eusebius of Caesarea's *Against Porphyry*, all known to have influenced Antiochene authors.⁵⁶ As these are lost, we cannot specify further the source behind the shared formulations within the Antiochene authors on this objection.

Two conclusions follow. First, Chrysostom draws upon preexisting *topoi*, typical biblical conundrums addressed from a blending of apologetic and exegetical angles. There is no evidence that Chrysostom was responding directly to Julian, even though some of his posed objections fit with Julian's own. From our limited perspective, the sequence and causal relation of the blending of apologetic and exegetical elements is difficult to discern; once a cake has been baked it is almost impossible to determine the order in which the elements are added. But it is notable that polemics and exegesis developed in the same fourth-century text-webs, and that this connection was fruitful for the production of Chrysostom's homilies. Second, among multiple Antiochene authors and other Christian writers associated with this milieu (Basil, Titus), specific terminology and ideas were shared to handle these formidable problems, suggesting again a kind of school environment and the direct interaction with common materials. A context of learning and intentional appropriation of Antiochene resources lies behind Chrysostom's work.

3 Narrative Coherence

In his *Commentary on Genesis*, Eusebius of Emesa addressed problems of narrative coherence and potential contradiction. As seen from the case studies in Part I, these were major concerns for John Chrysostom's pedagogy, and they also served to heighten his audience's attention and awareness. In both Chrysostom and Eusebius, these problems could concern the Old Testament alone, but very often the goal appears to be harmonization of the Old and New. In common with Eusebius, Chrysostom addressed, albeit sometimes in reduced form, the

56 Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 415–419 for discussion of the complex relationship between George, Titus, and Diodore. According to ancient testimony, Titus was reliant on George's *Against the Manichaeans*. It is unclear how Diodore's work of the same title fits into the picture, but it seems likely that he drew upon George, Titus, or both. For an in-depth overview of Titus and George, see M. DelCogliano, 'The Literary Corpus of George of Laodicea', VC 65.2 (2011), 155–161.

problems around the chronology of Abram's migration, the location of the first theophany, the duration of Israelite slavery, and the confusing scene of Jacob's deathbed.

3.1 *Abram's Migration*

The first text concerns that studied in the Case Study of Chapter 2, the migration of Abram. Eusebius of Emesa had raised a potential contradiction in this pericope, which he poses in a series of three 'questions' (ἑρμηνείαι),⁵⁷ between passages in the Old and New Testaments. In Gen 11,31, God calls Tharra, Abram's father, to leave his homeland in Mesopotamia and head towards Canaan. Tharra dies amidst the journey, while in a land called Charran. There, in Charran, the calling is transferred to Abram. But Acts 7,2–4 records a speech of Stephen which claims that God summoned *Abram*, not Tharra, from Mesopotamia (Ac 7,2–4). Eusebius asks: why does Stephen say that Abram was summoned while living in Mesopotamia, when on the other hand the Genesis text says that he was summoned while in the land of Charran? John Chrysostom also knows a problem (ζήτημα) at this point: it seems that 'Scripture contradicts itself' (ἐναντιοῦται ἑαυτῇ ἡ θεία Γραφή).⁵⁸ Yet, Stephen does not contradict the Genesis account, Chrysostom surmises, because the transfer of the blessing to Abram in Charran presupposes that the blessing of Tharra in Mesopotamia was originally intended for Abram in the first place.

A lengthy fragment from Diodore on this question survives in the *Collectio Coisliniana*. It indicates a confused application of Eusebius. For Diodore the issue is not a contradiction between Genesis and Acts but an ambiguity (ἀμφιβολίαν) in the Genesis text itself which is solved (λύει) by the Acts text.⁵⁹ In Diodore's estimation, the problem is the possibility that God did not know Abram's destination, illustrated by Tharra settling down to die in Charran. The Acts text supplies an insight to the story, namely that God spoke to Abram in Mesopotamia, and not to Tharra. The three exegetes thereby share a similar affirmation of the veracity of the Acts account, but Chrysostom reprises Eusebius's version of the problem, not Diodore's.

57 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 58a–f (TEG 15.106–108). Question one is addressed here; two and three relate to other aspects of the narrative, namely how Lot and Sarah fit into the picture. Chrysostom and Diodore do not appear to have mentioned the latter two.

58 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 31.3 (PG 53.285–286).

59 Diodore, *Coisl.* 177,7–11 (CCSG 15.173).

3.2 *The First Theophany*

Another problem is raised in the migration pericope mentioned above. It was mentioned that the call of Tharra is transferred to Abraham in Charran, or the plains of Sychem. This happens in Gen 12,7. To affect this transfer, God ‘appeared’ (ὤφθη) to Abraham. As remarked by some patristic authors, this is the first time that the biblical text specifies an appearance of God. But this is confusing, as it seems that God appeared to Abraham and Tharra when making the initial calling to Tharra in Mesopotamia, told in Gen 11,31.⁶⁰ Eusebius of Emesa knows this as a question, namely ‘why’ (ὡστὺς) the first divine appearance is on the plains of Sychem and not in Mesopotamia, the place of the initial calling.⁶¹ Eusebius of Emesa adheres to the wording of the biblical text: God ‘first’ (ἡμῶν) appeared to Abraham on the plains of Sychem. On this point John Chrysostom sees a great treasure (θησαυρός) in the details (βραχέσι) that will lead to ‘the discovery of the questions’ (πρὸς τὴν τῶν ζητουμένων εὕρεσιν).⁶² He insists that on the plains of Sychem we are dealing with the first biblical theophany: ‘it is the first time in the scripture that we find the term’ (πρῶτον τοῦτο εὕρισκομεν ἐν τῇ Γραφῇ νῦν τὸ ῥηθέν). Material from Diodore on this point does not survive for comparison, but it suffices to show that John Chrysostom was aware of a subtle discussion signaled by Eusebius of Emesa, and our preacher sticks close to aspects of the terminology and ideas paved by his exegetical grandfather.

3.3 *The Duration of Slavery in Egypt*

John Chrysostom follows strategies similar to those found in Eusebius of Emesa when it comes to problems of considerable technical difficulty that circulated in late antique biblical exegetical culture. Some of these concerned chronological problems found in Gen 15,12–16 and Ex 13,18.⁶³ These texts presented two problems on the duration of the Israelite exile in Egypt. First, there was the matter of its longevity. In the Gen 15,16, it seems foretold that the Israelites will remain exiled as slaves for 400 years, what the LXX paraphrases as ‘four

60 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecl. Proph.* 1.3 (GAISFORD, 6). See Chapter 8 for further discussion of Chrysostom’s awareness of this and similar approaches to theophanic accounts given by Eusebius of Caesarea.

61 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 60b (TEG 15.110).

62 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 32.2 (PG 53.294).

63 See H. Inglebert, *Interpretatio Christiana. Les mutations des savoirs (cosmographie, géographie, ethnographie, histoire) dans l’Antiquité chrétienne (30–630) après J.-C.*, EAA 166 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), 127–158 for an outline of the Jewish and Christian works of Late Antiquity organizing geographical, ethnographical, and chronological knowledge from the bible.

generations' (τετάρτη δὲ γενεά). Yet this stands out as a complete overestimation when measured against the generations of Israelites enumerated in the text of Ex 6,14–27: the number is closer to 200. Second, this inaccurate counting notwithstanding, there was an outright contradiction with the text of Ex 13,18. When all was said and done, the LXX Exodus 13,18 text—not the Hebrew—concludes, the slavery lasted 'five generations' (πέμπτη δὲ γενεά), whereas the LXX text of Genesis 15,16 mentions only four generations.⁶⁴ The problems were widely known to patristic authors; Chrysostom's awareness in itself does not demonstrate a special connection between him and the Emesene.⁶⁵ A closer examination of the terminology and ideas used to address the problems, however, situates them closely. In his *Commentary on Genesis*, Eusebius of Emesa explains the bizarre 400-year enumeration as a delay showing the 'longsuffering' (ἐνὶ μακροθυμίᾳ) of God.⁶⁶ A similar display of mercy may be seen, he goes on, when God gave those of the flood generation 120 years as a point of time to repent (ἤξουν ... ἡμερῶν). A *catena* fragment indicates that Eusebius of Emesa recognized a 'great problem' (μέγα ζήτημα) concerning the second issue mentioned above.⁶⁷ He resolves it by beginning the count 'from the patriarch Jacob' (ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰακώβ), Abraham's grandson.

For his part, John Chrysostom says that 'one might inquire here' (ἐνταῦθα ἂν τις διαπορήσειε):⁶⁸ the Israelites spent 'not half this time' (οὐδὲ τὰ ἡμίση) in slavery.⁶⁹ So, how could the 400 years in Gen 15,13–16 refer to their exile in Egypt? He resorts to the same strategy taken by Eusebius. He claims that you can find that the 400 years is correct if you start 'to enumerate the time from the patriarch [Abraham]' (συναριθμεῖσθαι καὶ τὸν χρόνον τοῦ πατριάρχου), not the exile. More precisely, he means, the enumeration begins from the time Abraham left his homeland. This is not the same answer as Eusebius, but there is the shared strategy of beginning the count with a patriarchal figure and not when the Israelites are in Egypt as slaves. In a rare moment, Chrysostom assures his

64 'Five generations' in the LXX is a mistranslation from the Hebrew. See Le Boulluec-Sandevoir, *L'Exode*, 160.

65 E.g., Ambrosiaster, *QVNT* 10 (CSEL 50.34); Didymus, *In Gen.* 231 (SC 244.191); Theodoret, *Q. Ex.* 40.2 (LEC 1.290).

66 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 65a (TEG 15.116). The same explanation is in Ephrem, *Comm. Gen.* 12.4.2.

67 Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat. Ex.* 182,10 (TEG 10.152–153). Cf. *ibid.*, 400 (280).

68 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 37.3 (PG 53.346).

69 This specific aspect of 'half the time' is not present in the surviving *catenae* fragments of Eusebius; it is unclear from where Chrysostom got it. A tradition known in the 5th and 6th-century to Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad* 15,5 (GCS NF 22.252,64–253,77) says that they stayed 215 years. Compare with this text Anonymous, *Cat. Ex.* 375 (TEG 10.266).

audience: because the biblical text supplies Abraham's age as 75 when he left Charran, 'if someone wished to count' (Εἰ βούληθείη τίς ἀριθμῆσαι), then one could add up the years from here to the exodus and see that it will add up to approximately 400. Further, he seems to use the same idea employed by Eusebius to express this as a moment of God's 'longsuffering' (μακροθυμίαν); God measures punishments in accordance with our limitations. Finally, recalling Eusebius's explanation concerning the flood, Chrysostom claims that the prolongation of the 120 years in the age of the flood was a 'time' granted 'for repentance' (καιρὸν ... πρὸς τὸ μεταβαλέσθαι), a point presaged by Origen.⁷⁰ We thereby see what Amirav identified as a characteristic Antiochene exegetical concern to show 'God's relentless efforts to prevent the moral deterioration of mankind' by pointing to God's 'reluctance to fulfil his threats'.⁷¹ Chrysostom could reach this goal through the exact same strategies used by Eusebius of Emesa.

3.4 *Jacob's Deathbed*

A similarly complicated knot emerges surrounding Jacob's deathbed scene, studied in the context of John Chrysostom's *Homily 66 on Genesis* in Chapter 4. In Gen 37,10, Joseph has a dream in which everyone in his family is figured to bow down to him in veneration. Later, when his father Jacob is dying, he seems to bow to his son. But the phrase in Gen 47,31 describing this scene is obscure, for Jacob is there made to lower his head 'towards the tip of his staff' (ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ). Ancient exegetes were remarkably sensitive to this description. In Eusebius of Emesa, 'some say' that this bowing is a sign of 'royalty' (βασιλεία; ρωμαινηριπρωάν).⁷² Eusebius was curious to whom, or what, Jacob bowed. Was it his own staff, or that of Joseph? The Septuagint's vague designation 'his staff' left room for both. The Emesene is unsure: he leaves the question open, citing the opinions that it may be either his own staff or that of Joseph, and moving on. Diodore follows Eusebius of Emesa in this discussion and concludes with similar indecision.⁷³ But in Chrysostom's hands, the problem concerns the rapport of Gen 37,10 with 47,31. How does the deathbed scene

70 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 25.1 (PG 53.219); Origen, *Cath. in Ps.* 4.13–21 (TU 183.16–18).

71 Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 227.

72 Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 2072 (TEG 4.320): ἔφην; *Comm. Gen.* 138 (TEG 15.166): Πῶς αὐτὸν αὐτοῦ.

73 Diodore, *Coisl.* 291 (CCSG 15.264–265). He knows Eusebius's options and adds another ('or': ἢ): it could be to God that Jacob bows. Elaborating further, this could be 'of the one having reigned' (βασιλεύσαντος), invoking a worship ceremony as enacted by David and Solomon (3 Reg 1,47). The mention of royalty and this biblical text indicates reliance on Eusebius, as both elements are present in his commentary.

align with the prophecy mentioned earlier in the Genesis narrative? If we take Jacob bowing to his son Joseph to be the fulfillment of the dream, Chrysostom reports the view that ‘someone might say’ (ἀλλ’ ἴσως εἴποι τις) that his mother was unable to participate in the bowing, an important detail because the prophecy specified that both mother and father would bow.⁷⁴ Someone, that is, might object to the text’s coherence. A remarkably technical matter is thereby raised for Chrysostom’s audience. This particular problem does not appear discussed in the surviving material of Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore. Chrysostom deals with it in two phases. First, this bowing tells of the ‘royal race’ (βασιλικού γένους) which would stem from Joseph, terminology reflected in Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore, but applied by Chrysostom systematically throughout his exegesis of Gen 49–50 in ways that Eusebius and Diodore would not countenance.⁷⁵ Second, Chrysostom then addresses the problem of dream fulfillment directly. The problem involving Joseph’s mother, an apparent contradiction, may be resolved through the idea of a synecdoche (studied in Chapter 4.2.3.3). Scripture always has this habit (ἔθος αἰεὶ), Chrysostom says, namely showing ‘the whole from the more dominant example’ (ἀπὸ τοῦ κυριωτέρου τὸ πᾶν δηλοῦν). A case in point is Gen 2,24, which explains that the man is head of the woman. Chrysostom’s logic is that if the father bowed, then the mother did, too. Therefore, the bowing of Jacob is a fulfillment of Joseph’s dream. We thereby see Chrysostom’s stance towards his predecessors as nuanced. He is in line with the fact that a problem needed be raised at the death-bed text, and to elaborate, he uses some of the terminology witnessed in Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore, such as the mention of the royal race. But the preacher goes a different direction in his articulation of the problem. Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore do not envision a potential contradiction with the earlier prophecy, but rather the question of to whom, exactly, Jacob bowed. It is notable that Theodoret would later follow Chrysostom regarding this question.⁷⁶

Combined with other cases in this dossier such as the chronology of Abraham’s migration, we thereby see that Eusebius of Emesa raised questions that Chrysostom also judged apt for studying the bible from a critical angle. But what explains their differences? It may be that Chrysostom was reducing Eusebius’s technical discussions for a simpler presentation. Alternatively, he may have relied on another source entirely or combined another source with his knowledge of Eusebius’s material. We may approach the clarification of this

74 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 66.2 (PG 54.567).

75 The full evidence is in Chapter 7 where Eusebius of Caesarea is shown to be the source for Chrysostom’s typological exegesis of the Blessing of Jacob in Gen 49.

76 Theodoret, *Q. Gen.* 111 (LEC 1.202).

predicament by inquiring further the extent to which Chrysostom was capable of outright disagreeing with the opinions expressed by his predecessors.

4 Departures from Eusebius and Diodore

There is a series of cases in which Chrysostom raises exegetical problems that are not found in the Eusebius of Emesa's *Commentary on Genesis* but are found in other exegetes associated with the Antiochene school. We consider three: the odor of Noah's sacrifice, the setting apart of creation, and Abraham's hospitality.

4.1 *The Odor of Noah's Sacrifice*

Consider the example of commentary on Gen 8,21. In this text, God 'smelt' (ὡσφράνθη) the odor of Noah's sacrifice. Chrysostom is certain that this text must be interpreted metaphorically. The smelling is really God searching after Noah's 'mindset' (γνώμην).⁷⁷ Theodoret appears to follow Chrysostom on this point: God received Noah's 'right mindset' (εὐγνώμον).⁷⁸ Eusebius of Emesa does not comment on this part of the verse, however.⁷⁹ Fortunately, a firmly attributed comment of Diodore's survives on this text. Both the tacit question and his answer are different than the material in Chrysostom and Theodoret. Diodore appears to have been occupied with explaining why God 'had agreed' (συνεχώρησεν) to accept sacrifices in the first place.⁸⁰ His answer is that God 'foresaw' (προειδώς) that it would help the Israelites later when they needed to be 'avoiding the sacrificing to idols' (τοῦ θύειν εἰδώλοις ἀφιστῶντα). By seeing 'from the fathers' (ἐκ πατέρων) that sacrifices could be made to God, they would instead sacrifice 'to God' (τῷ θεῷ).⁸¹ Based on the surviving material, neither Eusebius nor Diodore deal with the anthropomorphism. The resources of the Antiochene exegetical group were clearly diverse. This is a strong case, as Amirav has highlighted just how important Septuagint anthropomorphic text expressions were for the Antiochenes.⁸² It is plausible to assume that Eusebius and Diodore would have reason to comment on this text, but their lack is striking; Chrysostom may have furnished his own explanation.

77 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 28.2 (PG 53.242; FOC 82.166).

78 Theodoret, *Q. Gen.* 53 (LEC 1.112).

79 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 48b (TEG 15.96–98).

80 Diodore, *Coisl.* 151,1 (CCSG 15.151).

81 *Ibid.*, 5–9.

82 Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 144–145.

4.2 *Consecration of the Sabbath Day*

As a second example, we may consider a case from the creation account. It is useful to recall that we have already established Chrysostom's dependence on Eusebian explanations of important aspects of the creation, such as the 'placing' of the stars in the sky or the 'spirit of God' hovering over the waters. The question on Gen 2,3, is why God 'set apart' the seventh day of creation. All with the exact same term, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom, and Theodoret answer that this verb 'set apart' means 'he distinguished' (ἀφώρισεν) the seventh day from the other days.⁸³ All three Antiochenes use glossular formulas to introduce the term. Chrysostom asks, 'What does this mean' (τί ἐστὶ)? Theodore and Theodoret explain the term with the common paraphrase formula, 'instead of' (ἀντὶ τοῦ). Eusebius of Emesa does not see a question worth asking regarding this term; he simply states that Gen 2,3 is the end of the creation.⁸⁴ The common use of the term ἀφώρισεν to gloss 'set apart' with similar formulas indicates a common source amongst these Antiochene authors, but the fact that this common source does not appear to be Eusebius of Emesa is evidence that more Antiochene resources circulated for Genesis exegesis.

4.3 *Abraham's Hospitality*

A final case regarding Chrysostom's non-Eusebian resources emerges with a discussion on Abraham's hospitality. Abraham was known in Jewish and early Christian exegetical tradition for being a model of hospitality, in particular for his sharing of food with divine being(s) in Gen 18.⁸⁵ Yet one detail in particular gives Chrysostom pause. To introduce the scene of Abraham's hospitality, the text says that he was sitting in his tent (18,1). Chrysostom wondered, What is so virtuous about this? 'We shall unfurl the treasure' (ἀναπτύξωμεν τὸν θησαυρὸν) of its meaning.⁸⁶ The treasure is that Abraham's hospitality is extravagant. Chrysostom proves this by citing Gen 14,14, which tells that he has 318 servants (τριακοσίους δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ οἰκογενεῖς) at this disposal. A fragment from the *catenae* shows that Acacius of Caesarea, whose *Miscellaneous Questions*

83 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 11.7 (PG 53.89); Theodoret, *Q. Gen.* 21 (LEC 1.56); Theodore, *Coisl.* 76,33 (CCSG 15.81). The fragment is confirmed by the Diyarbakir commentary. For dating of Theodore's commentary on Genesis, see F.G. McLeod, *Theodore of Mopsuestia. The Early Church Fathers* (London–New York: Routledge, 2009), 73 suggests that Theodore's commentary on Genesis was composed after Chrysostom's.

84 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 10b (TEG 15.44).

85 E. Grypeou–H. Spurling, 'Abraham's Angels: Jewish and Christian Exegesis of Genesis 18–19,' in E. Grypeou–H. Spurling (eds.), *The Exegetical Encounter between Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity*, JCS 18 (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2009), 181–212, esp. 194.

86 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 41.3 (PG 53.378).

were related to Eusebius of Emesa's biblical commentary,⁸⁷ made the exact same move, explaining the marvel of Abraham's hospitality with reference to the 318 servants in waiting (ὁ τῇ καὶ δέκα κεκτημένος οἰκογενεῖς).⁸⁸ But Eusebius of Emesa's Genesis commentary mentions no such interesting connection between Abraham's hospitality and the extravagant servant-team at his disposal. This case has less to do with potential contradiction, and more with citing the same biblical texts to show coherence in the narrative.

These cases advance the supposition that Chrysostom's knowledge of exegetical problems does not arise from the selections of Eusebius of Emesa or Diodore alone, and that clear departures are discernible where Chrysostom draws on other models where Eusebius and Diodore did not appear to offer comment or where their standing comments were unsuitable for his purposes. To substantiate further this picture, we consider where Chrysostom outright disagrees with these two figures.

5 Disagreements with Eusebius or Diodore

We have seen that Chrysostom could reduce complex scholarly discussion of chronology in Antiochene authors to simpler issues of God's philanthropy. He could draw on other exegetical resources where Eusebius and Diodore did not supply material. He could use variant bible readings to discuss theological issues like the birth of the Church in a way that does not seem to have been presaged by Eusebius of Emesa or Diodore. But in several cases, he goes a bit further, posing direct disagreements with opinions expressed by these exegetes. Some of these cases seem to depict Chrysostom resisting complex discussion. But in others, he engages a firm exegetical opinion and outright disagrees. We consider three issues, concerning the prohibition to eat from the tree, Abraham's altar, and Noah's diet.

5.1 *The Prohibition in the Garden*

First, consider the problem of the addressee of the prohibition to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Gen 2,16 is clear: God spoke this prohibition to Adam (τῷ Ἀδὰμ); Eve does not appear envisaged in the command. Indeed, she was not yet created—her creation occurs in Gen 2,21. Exegetes

87 R.B. ter Haar Romeny, 'Early Antiochene Commentaries on Exodus', in *StPatr* 30 (1997), 119 showed that on several points, Acacius was concerned with the same problems found in Eusebius of Emesa.

88 Acacius *apud* Procopius *Ecl. Gen. ad* 18,8 (GCS NF 22.271,2) / *Cat.* 1072 (TEG 3.117).

wondered, is she thereby excluded from the moral law? Eusebius of Emesa admits that God commanded ‘Adam alone’ (Αἰνῶνι μόνῳ).⁸⁹ He eventually argues, though, that Eve was implicated ‘by anticipation’ (ὑποπροσπορεύσει). In this strict sense, Chrysostom contradicts both the literal sense of the text and the explanation of his predecessor. For the wider purposes of arguing that this command was not harsh or burdensome to its subjects, and that it stems from the generosity of the common lord of all things, our preacher insists that it was ‘as addressed to both’ (ὡς πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους διαλέγεται).⁹⁰ Like the explanation which John Chrysostom offered concerning Joseph’s mother and father, he relies on the biblical conception of the unity of man and woman to make his point. Both Moses and Paul, the logic goes, say that the two are one. So, what happens to one happens to the other. Adam ‘handed over’ (παράσχη) to Eve the ‘things that were spoken’ (ἐνταλθέντα) to him. The two Antiochene exegetes thereby used the same reasoning of implication and transfer of the command, but they disagree on how to present this material. For Chrysostom, Eve’s full awareness of the commandment from the very beginning is essential for the meaning of the fall, an emphasis paralleled but expressed differently by Theodore’s explaining Adam and Eve as necessarily mortal from the beginning in order to resolve the problem of foreknowledge of their later punishment.⁹¹ Independently, Adam and Eve exercised free will and disobeyed. Eusebius, essentially saying the same thing, does not feel the need to manipulate the plain sense of the biblical text to preserve human free will.⁹²

5.2 *Abram’s Altar*

Another subtle disagreement concerns the explanation of the altar (θυσιαστήριον) which Abram made to commemorate God’s promise to him and his descendants (Gen 12,8). Oddly,⁹³ Eusebius of Emesa denies that this ‘altar’ signified an act of prayer (ἡ προσευχή).⁹⁴ Instead, it speaks of the ‘heritage’

89 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 16a (TEG 15.54).

90 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 14.4 (PG 53.115).

91 P.-W. Lai, ‘The *Imago Dei* and Salvation among the Antiochenes: A Comparison of John Chrysostom with Theodore of Mopsuestia’, *StPatr* 67 (2013), 393–402.

92 See the useful summary of Eusebius’s exegesis of this text in Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 371–379.

93 Lust–Eynikel–Hauspie, *Lexicon*, ad loc. counts 437 uses, 184 of which are in the Pentateuch alone—the word was hardly rare in biblical literature. Further, it was used to name a common aspect of liturgical space in Late Antique Christianity. Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* 5.22.53 (GCS NF 1.302,11–12), for instance, reports that in Antioch the ‘altar’ (θυσιαστήριον) faced not the east but the west.

94 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 60a (TEG 15.110).

(δωνωσύνουρην) promised to Abram. Like Enoch (Gen 4,26), Eusebius reasons, Abram recognizes that he has been called by God and promised descendants and land. The 'altar' is a testament to this fact. But Chrysostom affirms precisely what Eusebius of Emesa denies. 'What is this' (τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστίν),⁹⁵ he asks. 'It means a prayer of thanksgiving for the promises made' (ἀντὶ τοῦ, εὐχαρίστησεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπαγγελθέντων). Further, in making this a place of prayer, Abraham was 'predicting' (προλαβὼν) and 'fulfilled' (ἐπλήρου) what Paul in 1 Tim 2,8 calls the raising of the 'hands of prayer'. Actually, according to Chrysostom, Abram is really the originator of this practice. On its own this is not a particularly brilliant comment; we are not surprised to find a preacher relating the Old Testament to images with liturgical resonances for his audience. Yet in comparison with Eusebius's strict denial that Abraham's 'altar' signified the practice of prayer, Chrysostom's move stands in a different light, for he disagrees on a detailed matter with Eusebius of Emesa. The extent to which the disagreement was conscious is not possible here to determine, though based on what we have seen from Chrysostom's dependence on Eusebius at other points in this chapter, it stands to reason that Chrysostom would have been aware of Eusebius's opinion. This view is supported by the fact that Didymus, a contemporary biblical exegete working in Alexandria, explains this exact 'altar' as an expression of thanksgiving (εὐχαριστίας), just as Chrysostom.⁹⁶ The views were evidently in circulation, and Chrysostom seems to have selected the one with the most obvious spiritual benefit for his audience. However, as Chrysostom does not name alternative opinions, it is conjectural to suppose that he was disagreeing with Eusebius directly. For our purposes, we note that in his *Homilies on Genesis*, Chrysostom can answer a question raised by Eusebius from the very angle Eusebius rejects.

5.3 *Noah's Diet*

Another case, however, demonstrates that he was, in fact, able to disagree consciously with an opinion witnessed in Diodore. Chrysostom comes across a difficult expression regarding some dietary prohibitions that God gives to Noah upon exiting the ark after the flood. In Gen 9,4 Noah is hereafter prohibited to eat 'meat with the blood of its soul' (κρέας ἐν αἵματι ψυχῆς). Eusebius of Emesa wondered why God prohibited specifically this kind of meat;⁹⁷ he finds the answer in another part of the Gen 9,4 text. It is because God shall 'require' the

95 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom* 32.3 (PG 53.296; FOC 82.260).

96 Didymus, *In Gen.* 223,19 (SC 244.172). See further discussion of this text in Chapter 8.

97 In *apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad* 9,4–12 (GCS NF 22.206,1–6), he also sees it as a problem regarding future Jewish legislation which has not yet been given as of Noah's time.

blood of all living creatures, beasts and men alike, which Eusebius takes as a reference to the resurrection. The principle is to prohibit the consumption of that which will be resurrected by God. Further, he says, the blood is ‘life by the blood’ (ὡρῆται ὑπὸ τοῦ αἵματος) of an animal.⁹⁸ We see a similar discussion in Chrysostom’s *Homily 27 on Genesis*. The preacher wonders, ‘What does this word want [to say]’ (Τί οὖν βούλεται τὸ εἰρημένον)?⁹⁹ He specifies, ‘It means strangled’ (τοῦτ’ ἔστι, πνικτόν), and continues with a formulaic explanation: ‘The blood [of an irrational animal] is its soul’ (ἡ ψυχὴ τὸ αἷμα). Thus, God prohibits its consumption. But stating his case is not enough here; Chrysostom reports that ‘some say’ (λέγουσι γὰρ τινες) that the expression means ‘firm and earthly’ (βαρὺ καὶ γεῶδες). But this opinion, he believes, is based on ‘a more scientific account’ (φιλοσοφώτερον λόγον) and not on the law of the Lord. This opinion, represented by ‘some people’ (τινες), was likely that of Diodore. Diodore seems to know Eusebius of Emesa’s reference to the resurrection, as he explains the expression in question by ‘instead of, *living*’ (ἀντὶ τοῦ ζῶντος).¹⁰⁰ Focusing less on Eusebius’s theological approach, however, Diodore explains that such blood is ‘earthlier’ (γεωδέστερόν) and ‘heaviest’ (βαρύτατον) for digestion. It appears that Diodore, or Diodore’s source, is Chrysostom’s otiose naturalist, the unnamed interlocutor with whose ‘scientific’ interpretation of the biblical terminology he disagrees in this case. Diodore and Chrysostom appear to have used Eusebius of Emesa as a common source and developed their answers in different directions, yet with the possibility of mutual reference.

From the vantage point of this final example, Chrysostom displays considerable knowledge of multiple Late Antique biblical exegetical traditions centered around issues brought up by his predecessors. It will be noticed further that neither Diodore nor Eusebius provide the word which Chrysostom uses to explain the concept in Gen 9,4. For Chrysostom this text means ‘strangled’ (πνικτόν) meat. From where does Chrysostom draw this gloss? Likely from another exegetical tradition. When faced with the Noachic commandments (Gen 9,1–4), Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium during Chrysostom’s early preaching career, explains that this peculiar expression concerning the soul and the blood of an animal really just means ‘strangled’ (πνικτόν) meat.¹⁰¹ It would seem

98 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 49a (TEG 15,98).

99 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 27.4 (PG 53,246).

100 Diodore, *Coisl.* 154 (CCSG 15,153,9). Deconinck counted this as a dubious fragment, but it is confirmed as Diodoran in Petit’s edition by all three mss in Family C and the Moscow mss.

101 Amphilochius, *C. Haer.* 19,743 (CCSG 3,204). The notion of strangled meat appears with this term several times in the book of Acts (15,20; 15,29; 21,25). Amphilochius knows these

unnecessarily complicated to assume that in this case Chrysostom researched the term in Amphilochius's text; they are likely drawing on a shared glossular tradition. To the extent that we are able to tell based on the surviving material, Eusebius and Diodore do not use the term. Chrysostom thereby used another tradition while engaging those which occupied his Antiochene predecessors on linguistic explanations.

6 Parallels to Ephrem

If John Chrysostom's work on Genesis indicates the influence of sources outside the commentaries of his immediate predecessors, to what extent does the work of Ephrem, often considered as an influence on or parallel to Antiochene exegetes, indicate shared traditions with John Chrysostom? In what follows, I consider five cases that suggest shared exegetical traditions between Chrysostom and Ephrem.

6.1 *The Harp of the Soul*

We first consider some metaphorical images Chrysostom applies to the making of man. In their interpretation of the image of God, Antiochenes are known to have placed emphasis on the ruling or authoritative function of man. Chrysostom certainly follows this aspect, and Lai has already noted that in doing so, he draws on a Jewish-Syriac notion of the pre-fall robe of glory and the harp of the soul.¹⁰² Evoking the biblical metaphor of God 'breathing' (Gen 2,7) into

references. In *C. Haer.* 20,755 (ibid., 205) he discusses the use of 'dispute' (ζήτησις) in Acts 15,2 concerning circumcision and dietary ethics in the early Christian community which absorbed Paul and Barnabas. He answers this problem with reference to Gen 1,31, which declares that God saw that all things were created good.

102 Lai, *Imago dei*, 402. For detailed examination of Antiochenes on the relationship between the ruling faculty of man, see N.V. Harrison, 'Women and the Image of God according to St. John Chrysostom', in P. Blowers et al. (eds.), *In Dominico Eloquio—In Lordly Eloquence: Essays on Patristic Exegesis in Honor of Robert Louis Wilken* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 259–279. For a fuller exploration of Chrysostom in particular, see ibid., 'Women, Human Identity, and the Image of God: Antiochene Interpretations', *J ECS* 9.2 (2001), 205–249; with attention to his ascetic accents, E.A. Clark, *Jerome, Chrysostom, and Friends. Essays and Translations* (New York–Toronto, 1979), 1–25; Chase, *Chrysostom*, 42–44. Theodore's comments are elusive, but fragments *Frag. Marc. Gr.* 573 (*Mus* 100.274–288) and *BL add.* 17,217 (*J ECS* 25/2.237–239) provide much insight. The latter offers a trinitarian reading and allegorical reference point to Christ's eschatological rule. A survey of Theodore on the 'image' is in F.G. McLeod, *The Image of God in the Antiochene Tradition* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999), 62–65. G. Kalantzis,

the dust figure of the human being, Chrysostom explains this metaphorically in four dimensions. First, the soul is an 'instrument' (ὄργανον), 'like a lyre' (καθάπερ λύρα).¹⁰³ Second, Chrysostom views parts of the body 'as through certain strings [δονάκων]'. Third, these strings animate the body 'bearing a melody [μελωδίαν] to the Lord'. Finally, this instrument awaits God's own breathing, signified by the verb given in the LXX (ἐνεφύσησε).

Musical metaphors for the soul and body frequently occur in Greek exegesis of the Psalms, such as in Eusebius of Caesarea's comments on Ps 80.¹⁰⁴ But the application of the harp to the soul in the context of the making of man in Gen 2,7 is found in one of Ephrem's *Hymn on Paradise*. He uses the same four elements as Chrysostom. He says, 'When the hand of the creator fashioned and formed the body so that it might sing hymns [ܠܝܪܥ] to its maker, this lyre [ܠܝܠܐ] was silent and has not voice, until at last he breathed [ܠܚܕ] into it the soul [ܠܢܦܫܐ] which sang therein. Thus, the strings [ܠܡܠܝܠܐ] acquired sound, and the soul, by means of the body, acquired speech to utter wisdom'.¹⁰⁵ Chrysostom and Ephrem apply the metaphor to this biblical text in similar ways: the body is likened to strings, the soul is understood as the animating principle of the lyre, and the purpose is for this unit to produce hymns to God. In what survives of their exegesis, the comments of Diodore, Theodore, and Eusebius of Emesa do not use this metaphor.¹⁰⁶ Its absence from Eusebius of Emesa is noteworthy; even if a lost text of Diodore is the source, it suggests a shared tradition with Syriac authors that did not occur through the likely candidate of the bilingual-resource presented throughout Eusebius of Emesa's *Commentary on Genesis*.

'Creatio ex Terrae: Immortality and the Fall in Theodore, Chrysostom, and Theodoret', *StPatr* 67 (2013), 403–413 compares Theodore, Theodoret, and Chrysostom on how to conceive of the effect of sin on human anthropology and beatitude.

103 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 13.2 (PG 53.108).

104 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Comm. Ps. ad 80*, 2–3 (PG 23.972a–b); John Chrysostom, *Exp. In Ps.* 145 (PG 55.522): 'Music is a certain excellence of the soul, the body is a craftsman's instrument' (μουσικός τις ἄριστός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ, τεχνίτης ἐστὶν ὄργανόν ἐστι τὸ σῶμα). This theme is explored in P.R. Kolbet, 'Athanasius, the Psalms, and the Reformation of the Self', *HTR* 99.1 (2006), 85–101, where the Psalter is mirror of the human moral life. In the context of Athanasius's *Letter to Marcellus on the Interpretation of the Psalms*, similar metaphors such as the strings of a harp are applied to the harmony of soul and body. Philo, *Immut.* 24 (PAO 2.61,9–10): 'just as a certain lyre is the soul musically harmonized' (ὥσπερ τινὰ λύραν τὴν ψυχὴν μουσικῶς ἀρμουςάμενον) is an early witness to the application of this musical metaphor to the soul. But it is not made in the context of explaining Gen 2,7.

105 Ephrem, *Parad.* 8.8 (CSCO 175.34,24–26; BROCK, 134).

106 Chrysostom's distinction from Theodore in using this metaphor is noted by Lai, *Imago dei*, 398.

6.2 *The Robe of Glory*

Second, Chrysostom witnesses some remarkably specific descriptions of the bodily condition of Adam and Eve prior to their disobedience. These descriptions are remarkable not for their linguistic formulations, but for the specificity of their application to the Genesis text in a way that parallels Ephrem. Chrysostom explains their condition in three phases. The original state, prior to disobedience, is the 'former one of glory' (δόξης τῆς πρότερον).¹⁰⁷ He understands this glory 'as a luminous garment' (καθάπερ ἱμάτιον λαμπρόν).¹⁰⁸ Second, upon their sin, this original glory is lost. Chrysostom here calls this loss 'the removal' (ἡ ἀφαίρεσις). The result is 'nakedness' (γυμνότητος), for 'Adam felt great shame' (τὴν χυλεπὴν αἰσχύνῃ). Ephrem, who devoted considerable exposition to garments in his understanding of the divine salvific economy at various points in his work,¹⁰⁹ sees Chrysostom's three elements in his own *Commentary on Genesis*: the garments of glory were created as an original possession; Adam and Eve 'marvel in the glory of which they were clothed' (ܡܠܟܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܡܠܟܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ); these garments were 'stripped' (ܕܡܠܟܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܡܠܟܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ); specifically 'after transgressing the commandment' (ܕܡܠܟܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܡܠܟܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܡܠܟܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ); as a result, their 'nakedness produces shame' (ܕܡܠܟܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܡܠܟܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܡܠܟܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ).¹¹⁰ Other Greek authors had applied clothing metaphors to moments in the salvific economy, as in Origen's description of garments at the resurrection.¹¹¹ But Alexandre notes that the specification of

107 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 17.2 (PG 53.136).

108 This precise wording occurs in a different biblical context in the texts of Origen cited below in n. 116. Mention of luminous bodies (ἀγγοειδεῖ), a different formulation, may belong to Origen, as attested in the *Antiochene florilegium apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad* 3.21 (GCS NF 22.151.46). For further discussion of this term in Origen, see I. Ramelli, *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis: A Critical Assessment from the New Testament to Eriugena*, SVC 120 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 204; H. Chadwick, 'Origen, Celsus, and the Stoa', *JThS* 48 (1947), 42–43 for discussion of the 10th anathema of the council of Constantinople in 543 C.E. which claimed that Origen used σφαίροειδές to describe the resurrection body in *De prin.* 2.10.3.

109 S.P. Brock, 'The Robe of Glory: A Biblical Image in the Syriac Tradition', *The Way* 39.3 (1999), 248–250; H. Hunt, '"Clothed in the Body": The Garment of Flesh and the Garment of Glory in Syrian Religious Anthropology', *StPatr* 54 (2012), 167–176; for the commentary on Genesis see A. Kofsky–S. Ruzer, 'Ephrem on Justice, Free Will, Divine Mercy in the Story of the Fall', in A. Kofsky–S. Ruzer (eds.), *Syriac Idiosyncrasies. Theology and Hermeneutics in Early Syriac Literature*, JSRC 11 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 327 and further documentation of this theme in Ephrem's work in T. Kronholm, *Motifs from Genesis 1–11 in the Genuine Hymns of Ephrem the Syrian with Particular Reference to the Influence of Jewish Exegetical Tradition*, Coniectanea biblica 11 (Lund: Gleerup, 1978), 107–110.

110 Ephrem, *Comm. Gen.* 2.14.2 (CSCO 152.33.9–11). For this translation of nakedness, see Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, 4172.

111 Origen, *Frag. Luc.* 140 (GCS 49.283.12) uses the clothing metaphor as an eschatological

Adam and Eve's prelapsarian state as clothed in garments of glory is not prominent among Greek and Latin exegetes.¹¹² Indeed, when faced with the tunics of skin (Gen 3,21) from which the metaphor derives, Eusebius of Emesa knows a similar idea, but expresses it in different terms. Adam possesses the 'crown of incorruptibility' (καὶ ἀνίκητον στέφανον ἀφ' αὐτοῦ), which he understands as human nature. Changed to corruptibility upon the fall, Eusebius's crown is a different image altogether than the image of glory and luminous garments found in Ephrem and Chrysostom.¹¹³ Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose comments on the coats of skin are preserved in the *catenae* and comparable in the Diyarbakir manuscript, does not reprise the garments of glory tradition.¹¹⁴ His focus, like Eusebius of Emesa, is on the corruption of human nature. Thus, there are shared concerns to explain the outward appearance of Adam and Eve before the fall and its theological significance, but Chrysostom's resources for doing so likely extend beyond the figure of Eusebius of Emesa and into a resource shared by Syriac traditions.

6.3 *Garments of Skin*

Conversely related to the garments of glory are the garments taken up after the fall. Gen 3,21, describes these as 'coats of skin'. This expression was bizarre for Greek readers of the bible and needed explanation. When Chrysostom comes across it, he exhibits a rare tendency towards aggadic interpretation. Curiously, he claims that these coats are 'sheep's wool' (ἐρίων τῶν προβάτων).¹¹⁵ From where did he get this idea? It does not appear to be from Eusebius of Emesa, Diodore, and Theodore. These authors vary in their decisions as to what, exactly, we are dealing with in the coats of skin. Diodore, along with Didymus,

figure associated with the resurrection; cf. *C. Mt.* 17.24 (GCS 40.660–669). In the former text, Origen speaks of these garments as a 'transformation, which shall be the form in abounding glory for the saints in the resurrection' (μεταμορφώσεως, ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει πολλῷ ἐνδοξότερον τὸ περὶ τοὺς ἁγίους εἶδος ἔσται). For Philo's influence on Origen on these points see Alexandre, *Le commencement*, 327–328.

112 Alexandre, *Le commencement*, 295. Aspects, however, are found in Didymus, *In Gen.* 106 (SC 233.250–254), though unlike Chrysostom he believes the garments prior to the fall as 'freedom from any-place from not having a body'; the garments of skin are human bodies, clearly from Origenian influence, discussion in P.D. Steiger, 'The Image of God in the Commentary *On Genesis* of Didymus the Blind', *StPatr* 42 (2006), 243–249.

113 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 19b (TEG 15.56).

114 Theodore, *Cat.* 348 (TEG 1.235); 445 (ibid., 286); *Coisl.* 120 (CCSG 151.123–124); *Frag. Gen.* 2 (SACHAU, 5.14–26) / Diyarbakir, *Comm. ad Gen* 2,25 (CSCO 483.44.3–21). None of these fragments contain the garment of glory tradition. See Devreesse, *Essai*, 19–22 and Lai, *Imago dei*, 397–399.

115 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 18.2 (PG 53.150).

for instance, gives leaves (φύλλα, from Gen 3,7), but Eusebius of Emesa does not specify.¹¹⁶ In what survives from Antiochene authors, their united concern was to reject Origen's allegorical reading as the embodiment of souls into flesh, which Chrysostom does not address here.¹¹⁷ Theodore, in fact, seems to deny a position related to Chrysostom's own. 'They are not from animals ... but bark' (οὐκ ἀπὸ ζώων ... ἀλλὰ τῶν τὰ φλοιᾶ).¹¹⁸ Gregory of Nyssa, for whom these coats signify death (ἡ νεκρότης), also says that they do 'not [come] from the nature of animals' (οὐκοῦν ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀλόγων φύσεως).¹¹⁹ Remarkably, then, we find Chrysostom agreeing most with Ephrem, who freely admits that the garments are 'from the skins of beasts' (ܐܬܝܬܘܢ ܡܢ ܥܘܪܝܐ).¹²⁰ Chrysostom's specificity is all the more remarkable here, for it appears that no Greek Christian exegete from the fourth-century held the Jewish position of sheep's wool. The notion of animal skins, sheep's wool in particular, is found in midrash and rabbinic traditions.¹²¹ From this vantage point it seems that Chrysostom's resources included Syrian-Antiochene material by which he could explain the text independently of his Greek exegetical contemporaries and predecessors.

6.4 Retribution and Slander

Another case considers a shared *testimonium* tradition. Chrysostom tries to justify the divine retribution of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18,20–21), an apparently brutal but in his mind merciful divine response to human violence. Further, his main point is that this destruction occurred with intention and was not done out of hand. His tactic is to cite a nexus of texts, akin to a *testimonium*:

116 Diodore, *Coisl.* 118,2 (CCSG 15,120); Didymus, *In Gen.* 106 (SC 233,250); Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 21 (TEG 15,71–72); Theodore, *op. cit.* n. 117; cf. Theodoret, *Q. Gen.* 39 (LEC 1,86–88).

117 Origen, *Coisl.* 121 (CCSG 15,124–125); *C. Cels.* 4.40 (SVC 54,257–258); A.L. Jacobsen, 'Genesis 1–3 as Source for the Anthropology of Origen', VC 62,3 (2008), 215; 222–231 analyzes Origen's interpretation of Gen 3,21 across five of his works.

118 Theodore, *Cat.* 445 (TEG 1,286) / Diyarbakir ms, *Comm. ad Gen.* 2,25 (CSCO 483,44,10–21). The catena and Diyarbakir agree with the clarity of this position, namely that the 'coats of skins' are not from animals. However, *Coisl.* 120 (CCSG 15,123,12–124,16) poses a difficulty of interpretation: ms *Moscow Synodal Library* 385 (ibid., 124,14) says that they are 'not only' from animals 'but also' from bark (οὐ μόνον ... ἀλλὰ καὶ).

119 Gregory of Nyssa, *Or. cat.*, GNO 3/4,30,16–17.

120 Ephrem, *Comm. Gen.* 2,33 (CSCO 152,45,8).

121 *Bereshit Rabbah* 20.12.2 (THEODOR–ALBECK, II:550; BJS 104,227); S.N. Lambden, 'From Fig Leaves to Fingernails: Some Notes on the Garments of Adam and Eve in the Hebrew Bible and Select Early Post-biblical Jewish Writings', in P. Morris–D. Sawyer (eds.), *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical, and Literary Images of Eden*, JSOTSup 136 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 80–89, esp. 85 and 89.

Ex 23,1–Rom 14,10–Mt 7,1–Ps 101,5. The argument which these texts support is that one should not condemn sinners on hearsay or, as Chrysostom puts it, ‘never from a mere slander-report’ (μηδέποτε ἀπὸ ψιλῆς διαβολῆς).¹²² Moses, Paul, Christ and David all have this teaching. Judging from a slanderous report is precisely what the divine being did not do in the case of Sodom and Gomorrah. According to Chrysostom we should, therefore, show mercy in the same way. Citing the exact same biblical texts, Ephrem makes the same point. It was not as if God ‘did not know’ (ܐܕܡ ... ܕܐܝܢ) that those of Sodom and Gomorrah had sinned. He continues, this was an example for judges ‘not to prejudge a case, even if based on reliable hearsay’ (ܕܝܢܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܐܝܢ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ).¹²³ The details of their use of these texts differ: in Ephrem the matter concerns reliable hearsay; in Chrysostom, slander. But it is noteworthy that at least on one occasion, the use of the same *testimonium* tradition occurs in the writings of Ephrem the Syrian and John Chrysostom, and in what survives of their expositions of Sodom and Gomorrah, other Antiochenes do not seem to mention this idea at all. Moreover, Chrysostom and Ephrem use this *testimonium* to make the same theological point about divine mercy and the general way the divine character is viewed in this striking passage.

6.5 Images of Resurrection

Finally, we consider some interesting references to the resurrection which Chrysostom and Syrian traditions found in the text of Genesis, particularly in the character of Seth and Enoch. In his *Homily 21 on Genesis*, Chrysostom suggests that Adam’s third son Seth indicates ‘murkily’ (ἀμυδρῶς) the resurrection (ἀναστάσεως),¹²⁴ an expression which he repeated elsewhere in his *œuvre*.¹²⁵ Here, Chrysostom bases this interpretation ‘through the expression’ (διὰ τοῦ ῥήματος) of the biblical text. The LXX-Gen 4,25 tells us that God ‘has raised up’ (ἐξανέστησε) another offspring for Adam after the death of Abel at the hands of his brother Cain. Origen knows an opinion which thought that, based on this word, Abel was ‘reincarnated’ (ἐξαναστάσεως) in the person of Seth.¹²⁶ He

¹²² John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 42.3–4 (PG 53.389).

¹²³ Ephrem, *Comm. Gen.* 16.1.2 (CSCO 152.76,26–28).

¹²⁴ John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 21.3 (PG 53.178).

¹²⁵ Acts 3,20 mentions ‘times of renewal’ (καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως), on which John Chrysostom, *In Acta apost. hom.* 9.4 (PG 60.80) says, ‘here it speaks murkily of the resurrection’ (ἐνταῦθα περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως διαλέγεται ἀμυδρῶς); cf. *Hom. dicta praes. Imperatore* 3–4 (PG 63.475–476), where he repeats the Enoch and Abel ‘murky’ referents; cf. *In ep. 1 ad Thess. hom.* 6 (EP 5.386–388).

¹²⁶ Origen, *In Jo.* 6.70 (GCS 10.121,1–7); Harl, *Genèse*, 119 shows that much of the Alexandrian Christian tradition developed an onomastic interpretation of Enoch as he who ‘wished to invoke’ the name of the Lord; Harl does not mention the resurrection.

denies it and does not expand further on the matter; it is possible that the connection of resurrection to the character of Seth was known in exegetical traditions. But it is curious that the application of the resurrection to Seth, more specific to Chrysostom, is found in several locations in Ephrem's hymns.¹²⁷ In his *Commentary on Genesis*, Ephrem writes that Adam was comforted by this just son, Seth (ܐܕܡܐ ܕܥܝܕܐ ܕܫܬܐ). All who lived like him would take up their place in the 'resurrection' (ܡܫܬܚܝܬܐ).¹²⁸

Chrysostom finds another 'murky' (ἀμυδρῶς) reference in the same *Homily*, but this time it is to the moment he describes as when God 'removed' the curse of Adam from 'its peaking over the human race' (ἀφῆκεν ἀκμάζειν τῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένει).¹²⁹ It is the character Enoch who invokes this idea. Fragments in the Greek *catenae* preserve several extracts from a sermon on Enoch and Elijah attributed to Ephrem, a Late Antique pseudepigraphical collection focused on apocalyptic motifs and connected to the Syrian milieu, but whose relationship to the Syriac Ephrem is far from clear.¹³⁰ One of them mentions that Enoch is a 'type and shadow' (τύπον καὶ σκίαν) of the abolishing of the 'authority' (αὐθεντίαν) of sin.¹³¹ With an aetiological description in the biblical text as 'taken up' by God, Enoch is seen by many church fathers as a type of the resurrection,¹³² and Chrysostom clearly knew a number of difficulties and possibilities here, as elsewhere in his work this tradition is addressed in a series of questions-and-answers.¹³³ But here in his *Homily 21 on Genesis*, Chrysostom seems to share with the Greek Ephrem fragment an interest specifically in the removal of Adam's curse. While witnessed in different sources, Chrysostom's 'murky'

127 Kronholm, *Motifs*, 132; 150–154.

128 Ephrem, *Comm. Gen.* 5.2.1 (CSCO 152.55, 8–10).

129 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 21.4 (PG 53.180).

130 Ephrem Graecus, *Serm. in Enoch et Eliam apud Cat.* 593, 595, 596, 597 (TEG 2.62–65); for a discussion of the problems of corpus-attribution and dating, and a useful literary-contextual study of Ephraem Graecus, see E. Grypeou, 'Ephraem Graecus, "Sermo in Adventum Domini". A Contribution to the Study of the Transmission of Apocalyptic Motifs in Greek, Latin and Syriac Traditions in Late Antiquity', in S.K. Samir–J.P. Monferrer-Sala (eds.), *Greco-Latina et Orientalia. Studia in honorem Angeli Urbani heptagenarii*, CNERU 2 (Beyrouth–Cordoba, Oriens Academic: 2013), 165–179.

131 Ephrem Graecus, *Serm. in Enoch et Eliam apud Cat.* 597, 1–2 (TEG 2.65).

132 E.g. Didymus, *In Gen.* 148–149 (SC 244.16–18), in which the material life is lifted. See further references with a concentration on Augustine in Harl, *Genèse*, 123 and Alexandre, *Le commencement*, 390–391.

133 John Chrysostom, *In ep. ad Heb. hom.* 22 (EP 7.253d): 'Many are those asking, To where was Enoch removed? And Why was he removed? And why did he not die, not him nor Elias? And, If he is yet still living, how is he living, in what form? But the asking exceeds' (Πολλοὶ δὲ ζητοῦσι ποῦ μετετέθη ὁ Ἐνὼχ, καὶ διὰ τί μετετέθη, καὶ διὰ τί οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, οὔτε αὐτός, οὔτε ὁ Ἡλίας, καὶ εἰ ἔτι ζῶσι, πῶς ζῶσι, καὶ ἐν ποίῳ σχήματι. Ἀλλὰ περιττὸν ταῦτα ζητεῖν).

references are shared by Syrian sources related to Ephrem. We note that these moves depart from how the characters of Enoch and Seth are handled in Eusebius of Emesa's *Commentary on Genesis*, suggesting that the rapport between Syrian and Antiochene exegetical traditions occurred outside the confines of the Emesene, our natural starting point for considering the witness of Syrian exegetical ideas in the work of John Chrysostom.

7 Conclusion

Chrysostom's profile as an exegete working with Antiochene sources is by no means a straightforward matter. He is informed by the exegetical questions-and-answers of his predecessors, and he displays both dependence and independence. His independence from other Antiochene authors is evidenced chiefly in his ability to draw on resources that they appear not to have used in regard to solving difficulties on specific texts. It is clear that Eusebius of Emesa set the stage for many exegetical problems for both Diodore and John Chrysostom. But this may have been the natural result of a common scholastic exegetical training which conveyed which questions may be raised at which texts. Some cases emerged that show the likelihood of independent access to Eusebius, however, as when Diodore and Chrysostom develop differently Eusebius's discussion of the contradiction between accounts of Abraham's migration in Genesis and Acts. Another instance of likely independent access to Eusebius is when Chrysostom explained the traverse of the stars across the heavens with a formulation close to that of Eusebius of Emesa but not witnessed by the Diodoran fragment on the same text. In other cases, it is likely that Chrysostom reduced complex scholarly discussion to a simpler issue for the format of his homilies, such as when the bowing of Jacob becomes a matter of prophetic fulfillment and not an issue of resolving obscure language in the Septuagint. However, often in such cases, a genuine exegetical difficulty is addressed. Similarly, the chronology of the Israelite exile is not studied to its full complexity, but the scholarly awareness of the matter enables him to present mastery of biblical complexities to prove the larger issue at stake, namely God's extended mercy—which is also discussed in the commentary of Eusebius. When Chrysostom moralized a scholarly debate, he represented aspects of the real difficulty and the learned solution.

Because the differences are often subtle and based around the same exegetical issue, their occurrence suggests fundamental Antiochene resources from which these exegetes could build their own argumentation, sometimes in reference to one another. An example of this dense network is the complex handling

of Noah's dietary commands. Eusebius, Diodore, and Chrysostom all know that the expression 'meat with the blood in its soul' needs explanation. But while Eusebius takes a theological angle, and Diodore a naturalistic angle, Chrysostom develops a middle road with reference to a glossular tradition known in another patristic author. What is more, our preacher seems aware of Diodore's option and rejects it outright. Other cases are less clear but gesture towards the same phenomenon. There is the variant reading of 'loins', which Chrysostom identifies as the genital organ. The same identification is made by Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa, but Chrysostom gives a Hexaplaric reading that is not found in his predecessors. There is also the striking case where Eusebius of Emesa denies that the 'altar' of Abraham signifies a house of prayer, whereas Chrysostom and Didymus of Alexandria affirm precisely this idea.

Chrysostom's distinction from Eusebius and Diodore may also be viewed from the angle of his parallels to Ephrem. Specific applications of metaphorical and theological ideas occur in Ephrem and Chrysostom. The case of the garments of skin is intriguing, as Diodore and Theodore seem aware of Chrysostom's opinion and reject it. This Jewish tradition, known to Chrysostom and Ephrem alike, likely migrated into Chrysostom's hands through a means other than the lineage of Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore. Similarly, Chrysostom's *Homily 21 on Genesis* finds two 'murky' references to theological themes, resurrection and the removal of sin, in characters and 'words' from the Genesis narrative—moves that Diodore and Eusebius do not seem to make. Chrysostom's sharing of ideas and traditions with those witnessed in Syrian texts suggests that the sources of the Antiochene school were considerably diverse, and the transmission of these ideas possibly did not occur in the straightforward manner of the succession of the commentaries of Eusebius and Diodore on the same biblical books. In this sense, Ephrem's work is an important witness to shared exegetical ideas that were available to Chrysostom. We noted that many of the images, such as the garments of glory or luminous bodies, were already in Origen, but that their application to specific biblical texts and metaphors suggests more than the sharing of a general exegetical culture. In this connection we note that several of Chrysostom's non-literal readings in the *Homilies on Genesis* are shared with, perhaps inspired by, Syrian resources. The likelihood of shared resources is advanced considerably by the case of the *testimonium* regarding judgement without hearsay. That Ephrem and Chrysostom apply the same four biblical texts to explain divine justice in the episode of Sodom and Gomorra is a remarkable case, made even more so by its absence from what survives of Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore. From this vantage point, Chrysostom's non-literal interpretations are consistent with his general rule that the biblical text itself must justify the reading, above all by providing specific words with

typological potential such as 'he raised'. But if the Ephraem Graecus texts testify to traditions contemporary with and prior to Chrysostom, the knowledge of tradition itself is just as strong a criterion for Chrysostom's hermeneutics. The complexity of Chrysostom's work in reference to his Antiochene predecessors thereby raises the question of what other ideas and sources outside Antiochene exegetical culture may be informing his decisions.

John Chrysostom and Basil of Caesarea

‘What could be more vital to the churches of the world than the Church of Antioch?’ Basil of Caesarea, the visionary theologian and ecclesiastical networker of the 350’s–70’s, provocatively put this question to Athanasius of Alexandria, whose support of Meletius Basil hoped to procure.¹ Perhaps exaggerating his case, Basil tried to convince Athanasius that if he supported Meletius in the Antiochene schism, then the health of the whole Church would follow.² While this letter was likely written in 360, it demonstrates Basil’s enduring investment in the ecclesiastical life of Antioch, which in another letter he says was there ‘from the beginning’;³ 13 years later, Basil would write the church of Antioch,

- 1 Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 66.2 (COURTONE, 1:158,9–10; DEFERRARI, 11:31); cf. *Ep.* 67.1 (COURTONE, 1:159,4–6). For contextualization of *Ep.* 66 within Basil’s attitudes towards the Antiochene schism and the Meletian party see J.-R. Pouchet, *Basile le Grande et son univers d’amis d’après sa correspondance*, SEA 36 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1992), 258–260. For Basil’s wider concerns about healing divisions within the churches see E. Vinel, ‘Basile de Césarée face aux divisions de l’Église d’après sa correspondance’, *Revue des sciences religieuses* 81.1 (2007), 79–93 and P. Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, TCH 20 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998), 133–190, 270–317, the latter providing a detailed account of Basil’s attempts to establish ecclesial unity throughout the eastern empire. See T.R. Karmann, *Meletius von Antiochien. Studien zur Geschichte des trinitätstheologischen Streits in den Jahren 360–364 n. Chr.*, Regensburger Studien zur Theologie 68 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2009) for Meletius’s activity around the 362 council. Under Athanasius’s guidance, they composed the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*. Therein, Athanasius attempted to find compromise between the Meletians and the Eustathians. See Ayres, *Nicaea*, 174–177 and S.-P. Bergjan, ‘Konkurrenz unter den Nizänern. Die Christen Antiochiens im 4. Jahrhundert’, in Bergjan–Elm (eds.), *Antioch II*, 405–409 for detailed analysis of the theological terminology at stake in this series of councils; for more general overviews of their events, T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, MA–London: Harvard University Press, 1993), 155–157 and K.M. Spoerl, ‘The Schism at Antioch since Cavallera’, in M.R. Barnes–D.H. Williams (eds.), *Arianism after Arius. Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), 101–126, for a full account of the dynamics between the three competing Antiochene theological groups during the 350’s–70’s.
- 2 Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 66.2 (COURTONE, 1:158,11–13; DEFERRARI, 11:31–32): ‘If it came to pass that this church returned to a state of concord, nothing would prevent its affording health, in the manner of a sound head, to the whole body’.
- 3 Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 244.3 (COURTONE 111:77,22): ἐξ ἀρχῆς; Pouchet, ‘Rapports’, 244–245 leans heavily on this expression, though Basil does not himself specify what his friendship with Diodore ‘from the beginning’ entails.

then under the auspices of Meletius to the chagrin of Athanasius, encouraging its resolution to maintain the Nicene symbol that he, Basil, had conveyed.⁴

Basil's concerns for Antiochene unity resulted in personal correspondences and friendships, Diodore of Tarsus and the bishop Optimus of Antioch prominent among them. Diodore was an auxiliary of Meletius and so a natural ally for Basil's goal of elevating Meletius to prominence. Even amidst exile, with Basil's help, Meletius was able to nurture the influence of Flavian and Diodore in the city, and eventually to achieve Diodore's election to the see of Tarsus in 378.⁵ But Basil's relationship with Diodore extended beyond ecclesiastical politics. The two studied together in Athens.⁶ Throughout their demanding and precarious ecclesiastical careers that followed, they remained in contact. Thus, in one letter, we find Basil offering friendly criticism of Diodore's work, praising it on the one hand for its concision and punctiliousness, but cautioning him on the other for verbosity.⁷ Yet his profundity of thought was in Basil's mind akin to Plato himself. Basil appears to have solicited the opinion of Diodore on a philosophical subject, to which Diodore replied by sending two of his books,⁸ a common practice among Late Antique *literati*.⁹ This picture may be supplemented by recalling that Basil shared with Diodore a famous exegetical tradition initiated by Eusebius of Emesa, the explanation of the 'spirit hover-

4 Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 140.2 (COURTONE, 11:61–62). For the role of this letter in the development of Basil's theological thinking, especially in relation to his assertion of the divine nature of the Holy Spirit, see J.-R. Pouchet, 'Basile de Césarée, éducateur de la foi et promoteur de la charité, d'après sa correspondance', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 102.1 (2007), esp. 18–19. For Athanasius's refusal to acknowledge Meletius's legitimacy, see Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 158. In 380, a year after Basil's death and around the time Chrysostom was ordained, Emperor Theodosius announced his support of the Meletian alliance, discussed in O. Hahn, 'The Election and Deposition of Meletius of Antioch: The Fall of an Integrative Bishop', in J. Leemans et al. (eds.), *Episcopal Elections in Late Antiquity*, AK 119 (Berlin–Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 357–374.

5 In Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 113–114 (COURTONE 11:16–19), he deals with the question of the divinity of the Holy Spirit amongst the churches at Tarsus, which paved the way for Diodore's election there. See M.A.G. Haykin, 'And who is the Spirit? Basil of Caesarea's Letters to the Church at Tarsus', *VC* 41.4 (1987), 380–381.

6 A. Sterk, *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church. The Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 144.

7 Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 135.1 (COURTONE 11:49,3–4): βραχύτητα ... πυκνόν. See discussion in Rousseau, *Basil*, 44.

8 Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 135.2 (COURTONE 11:51,20–25); Pouchet, 'Rapports', 251. It seems to have been a book about the benefits of Plato versus those of Aristotle.

9 J. Williams, 'Letter Writing, Materiality, and Gifts in Late Antiquity: Some Perspectives on Material Culture', *Journal of Late Antiquity* 7.2 (2014), 351–359.

ing over the waters' in reference to a 'wise Syrian'. Basil was well connected with both theological and exegetical positions of major ecclesiastical leaders of Antioch.¹⁰

It is natural, then, to wonder about John Chrysostom's position in regard to Basil's influence. That Chrysostom inherited the theological concerns of the Meletian faction in Antioch is likely.¹¹ And while Chrysostom ascended to the priesthood in the years 378–381, towards the end of Basil's life, he was active as the assistant of Meletius for several years prior to this.¹² To what extent does Chrysostom witness Basil's contact with and possible impact on Antiochene exegetical and theological resources? In this chapter, I address this question from the angle of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis*. First, I show that in one clear case, Basil's work figures as a literary source for Chrysostom. Then, on a more general level, I show that his *Homily 1 on Fasting* and *Homilies on the Six Days of Creation* witness explanatory formulations which Chrysostom also used in dealing with important themes emerging from the opening chapter of Genesis.

1 Letter 260

As seen above, many of Basil's letters concern his network correspondence and development of ecclesial alliances in support of what he saw as the unifying Nicene cause. Some letters therefore dealt with complex theological matters; essential developments of Basil's positions occur in *Letters* 9 and 361 (provided the latter's authenticity).¹³ It is a testament to the diversity of Basil's activity

10 See above, Chapter 5, n. 47 for references. It must be held as a possibility that either Diodore or Eusebius of Emesa was Basil's direct source. There has been some discussion about whether the anti-allegorical stance in Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 9.1 (GCS NF 2.146,11–147,22) was influenced by Diodore's rejection of Origenian allegory. R. Lim, 'The Politics of Interpretation in Basil of Caesarea's Hexaemeron', *VC* 44 (1990), 351–370, has soundly demonstrated that this was not the case. Basil was cautioning the improper use of allegory. Members of his audience had apparently requested to hear it, but Basil judged that it would be harmful for those not 'initiated'.

11 P.-W. Lai, 'The Eusebian and Meletian Roots of John Chrysostom's Trinitarian Theology', *Scrinium* 14.1 (2018), esp. 54–59.

12 Palladius, *Dial.* 5,34–40 (SC 341.110–112).

13 For discussion of the theology in these letters, see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea: sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner*, FKG 66 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 21–38. On the argument that *Ep.* 361 is authentic, D.A. Giulea, 'Basil of Caesarea's Authorship of *Epistle* 361 and His Relationship with the Homoiousians Reconsidered', *VC* 72.1 (2018), 41–70.

that alongside such pressing issues as the forging and maintaining of ecclesiastical alliances, he could take up correspondences which concerned biblical exegetical matters. One such correspondence is *Letter* 260, in which Basil responds to an inquiry from Optimus, bishop of Antioch c. 375–381.¹⁴ Optimus has sought the answer (λύσιν) to a heavily debated question (ἐπεζητήσας τὸ πολυθρύλητον) concerning an obscure line in the Cain and Abel narrative, alluding to the patristic exegetical culture motivated by questions-and-answers which we have studied thus far in the present volume.¹⁵ After cursing Cain, who had murdered his brother Abel, the divine voice surprisingly adds that ‘Whoever would kill Cain will receive a seven-fold vengeance’ (Gen 4,15). What, exactly, is this vengeance? Why is it seven-fold?

Optimus was not the first to inquire about the meaning of this biblical text, which connected to many other questions emerging from the already sparse narrative. It was presumed that the number seven corresponded to Cain’s sins, and clarifying these could elucidate typologies of evil practices and patterns to avoid. But beyond the clear case of fratricide, cases for the manifold depravity of Cain’s character had to be built from subtle clues in the biblical text. Speculative traditions developed around highlighting what these remaining six sins might be. The first Christian witness to such speculation appears to be Hippolytus, but similar reflections are also found in Gnostic Christian and Late Antique Jewish traditions regarding the relationship of the brothers, the source of Cain’s evil, and detailed matters like Cain’s murder weapon.¹⁶ Origen and

14 Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* 7.36.20 (GCS NF 1.386,6–8) records that upon the conclusion of the Theodosian council of Constantinople in 381, Optimus is numbered along with Diodore of Tarsus as an orthodox bishop in the diocese of Asia. See further discussion of Optimus’s orthodoxy in Tillemont, *Mémoires*, IX:497–498. Optimus exchanged some letters with Libanius, his former teacher, discussed in R. Cribiore, ‘Why Did Christians Compete with Pagans for Greek *Paideia*’, in K.M. Hogan et al. (eds.), *Pedagogy in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Early Judaism and its Literature 41 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2017), 365. These historical circumstances place him firmly within the educational and ecclesiastical environment of Chrysostom’s early formation.

15 Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 260.2 (COURTONNE III:105,12–13). In fact, Optimus asked him about three questions: the vengeance of Cain, the speech of Lamech to his wives (Gen 4,23), and Simeon and Mary.

16 Grypeou–Spurling, *The Book of Genesis*, 99–115 presents discussion in Rabbinic sources; cf. J. Byron, *Cain and Abel in Text and Tradition. Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the First Sibling Rivalry*, Themes in Biblical Narrative 14 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 110–112, for how the *Testament of Benjamin* and Philo’s *Questions on Genesis* share a common tradition of reflecting on the seven punishments, based on Cain’s sin as envy. The early Christian witnesses are Hippolytus, *De David et Goliath* 10.4 (CSCO 263,16; 264,12,1–6) and Origen, *Hom. Gen.* 1.17 (GCS NF 17.33,17–34,7) who share the mention of Cain’s concupiscence.

Acacius of Caesarea provide a list of sins which informs the background of Basil's response to Optimus.¹⁷

Grypeou–Spurling and Glenthøj have already studied the closely shared traditions of reflection on this topic. Glenthøj noted that the explanations of John Chrysostom and Basil are related, and that a list given by Diodore corresponds to several of their choices as well.¹⁸ We may go further and say that Basil was likely the common source of both Diodore and Chrysostom.¹⁹ The following table demonstrates this in greater detail. When possible, I reduce to single words their identifications of Cain's sins to show Chrysostom's adherence to Basil's terminology. Bolded cases in the columns of Basil and Chrysostom signify linguistic agreements between these two authors, and the bolded cases in Diodore's column signify his agreements with Chrysostom.

17 In this note I place in italics the common points that Origen and Acacius share with Basil and Chrysostom, whose lists are presented in Table 5. Origen, *Cat.* 541 (TEG 2.32): Cain (1) Did not choose (διεἶλεν) rightly; (2) Despised (κατεφρόνησεν) the divine commandment; (3) Killed (ἀπέκτεινεν) his brother; (4) Killed a righteous man (δικαίον); (5) Lied (ἐψεύσατο) (6) Caused (ἤτησατο) death. Numbers 3 and 5, the murder of his brother and the lie to God (Gen 4.9), are taken up in Acacius of Caesarea, Basil, and Chrysostom. Remaining comments on the sin of Cain are scattered throughout Origen's works, and largely in connection with original sin: J.B. Glenthøj, *Cain and Abel in Syriac and Greek Writers (4th–6th centuries)*, CSCO 567 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 21; 277; Origen, *Comm. Rom.* 5.12 (PG 14.1011), *In Jo.* 20.25 (GCS 10.360–362) and *De prin.* 4.3.6–7 (BEHR, 11:536–538). Acacius, *Frag. Gen. ad 4.15* (ST 201.114.3–4) : Cain was (1) Impious (ἀσέβειον) in regard to his chosen sacrifice; (2) *The murderer of a man* (ἀνδροφονίαν); (3) *The murderer of a brother* (ἀδελφοκτονίαν); (4) Hatched deceit (ἀπάτην); (5) *Used bait* (δόλον) to lure his brother to the field (Gen 4.8); (6) *A liar* (ψεύδης); (7) Audacious (θρασύτητα). This fragment comes from Barber. 569, which belongs to Type II of the catena; it is therefore not part of the *Collectio Coisliniana*. Acacius has a different approach than Origen to this question. We note Acacius's numbers 2 (murder), 3 (brother-murder), 5 (bait), and 6 (lie), which recur in Basil and Chrysostom. Acacius witnesses the distinction between general murder and brotherly murder; he also uses the word δόλος to explain Cain's enticement of Abel to 'come out to the field' in Gen 4.8. Basil has these elements, which are notably different from those of Origen, making it likely that Basil derives his answers from Acacius or a common source.

18 Glenthøj, *Cain and Abel*, 195 n. 344.

19 Glenthøj, *Cain and Abel*, 231 already suggests that Basil is Diodore's source, but he does not comment on the source for Chrysostom. Basil and Diodore share four agreements. Diodore offers two sins that are unique to the tradition: Cain's grief at not being admitted by God and his lack of tranquility (lines 2–3 in Table 5, above). Basil's answer to Optimus's inquiry would continue to gain prominence, as it is incorporated into Procopius's commentary and the *catena* tradition: Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad 4.15* (GCS NF 22.172–173) / *Cat.* 544 (TEG 2.34). No such list is given in Eusebius of Emesa or Ephrem.

TABLE 5 Basil, Diodore, and Chrysostom on the seven sins of Cain

	Basil ^a	Diodore ^b	Chrysostom ^c
1	φθόνος	ὑβρισεν	ἐβάσκηγε
2	δόλος	ἐλυπήθη	ἴδιον ἀδελφόν
3	φόνος	οὐκ ἡρέμησεν	δόλον
4	ἀδελφοῦ φόνος	ἐβάσκηγε	φόνον
5	πρώτος φονεύς	πιστευθεὶς ἐξαγαγὼν τὸν Ἀβελ εἰς τὸ πεδῖον ἀνεῖλεν	ἀδελφὸν ἐφόνευσεν
6	γονεῦσι πένθος	ψεύδεται τῷ θεῷ	πρώτος τὸν φόνον
7	ἔβδομον ὅτι Θεὸν ἐψεύσατο	ἐλύπησε τοὺς γεγεννηκότας	ἔβδομον ὅτι τὸν Θεὸν ἐψεύσατο

a Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 260.2 (COURTONNE III:107,28–108,38).

b Diodore, *Coisl.* 128,4–11 (CCSG 15.132).

c John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 19.5 (PG 53.164).

From the table above, it is clear that Basil, and not Diodore, is Chrysostom's source in his *Homily 19 on Genesis*. Chrysostom has six of Basil's seven sins: envy, bait, murder, fratricide, the first murder, and lie. With Diodore he only agrees on three points: envy, bait, and lie. Diodore's idea of bait is expressed differently than Basil and Chrysostom, for whom the term δόλος is shared. Similarly, Chrysostom appears to use Basil's wording for the sin of lying: 'the seventh is that he lied to God' (ἔβδομον ὅτι [τὸν] Θεὸν ἐψεύσατο). Also noteworthy is that Chrysostom and Basil share the hairsplitting distinction between the kinds of murders at stake: general murder, murder of brother, and first murder. Chrysostom precisely reproduces Basil's wording to describe these. One lapse occurs in the respective lists of Basil and Chrysostom, regarding the distinction made about different kinds of envy at work in Cain. First, Chrysostom notes, the envy itself is a sin. The second sin follows immediately: he envied his own brother. He thereby omits Basil's mention of the sin of causing grief to his parents (γονεῦσι πένθος). However, Chrysostom uses this idea later in *Homily 21 on Genesis*, witnessing the same term as Basil to describe the grief (πένθος) of Adam and Eve assuaged by God's providence.²⁰ Thus, his following of Basil is remarkably precise—he knows the whole list and its key terminology.

20 Ibid., 21.1 (PG 53.176).

Moving on from this list, in *Homily 19*, Chrysostom discusses the meaning of the number seven in the Old Testament. Basil does similarly. Their arguments and supporting data differ, but the structure of their argumentation is the same: to state the purpose of the number seven in the bible and adduce texts that illustrate the point. For Basil when we read the number seven, we should think about the ‘remission of sins’ (ἀφέσεως τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων).²¹ For Chrysostom, when we read the number seven, we should think about a ‘multitude’ (πλήθους).²² Our preacher possibly draws this discussion from Eusebius of Emesa, who remarks that the number seven regarding Cain’s punishment signifies his ‘many’ (ποικνύει) sins and their consequent punishments.²³ However, Eusebius of Emesa gives no list for Cain’s sins. Basil and Chrysostom also share the common technique here of quoting scriptural passages to support their ideas about what the number seven means. While Chrysostom adduces 1Sam 2,5, and Basil Deut 15,12 and Lev 25,10, they share the same methodological framework for addressing the text of Gen 4,8–15. The shared list of Cain’s sins with Basil on the one hand, and the shared idea of the ‘many’ with Eusebius of Emesa on the other, presents another case, similar to those seen in the previous chapter, where it appears that Chrysostom can draw upon multiple exegetical traditions at once, here with striking precision of detail.

2 *Homily 1 on Fasting*

Moving from a strong case of likely dependence, we consider parallels which indicate closely shared resources. Chrysostom’s *Homily 1 on Genesis* and Basil’s *Homily 1 on Fasting* offer such a case. Basil composed two homilies on fasting.²⁴ The first was disseminated at a relatively rapid rate and considerable distance. Already Rufinus (c. 340–410) had loosely translated and adapted it into Latin.²⁵ It is one of Basil’s longer sermons and rich in theological imagery, biblical exegesis, and typology. In the table below I demonstrate the extensive parallels

21 Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 260.3 (COURTONE III:107,5–6).

22 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 19.5 (PG 53.164).

23 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 36c (TEG 15.86).

24 Basil of Caesarea, *De jej.* 1–2 (PG 31.164–197; PPS 50.55–81).

25 Rufinus, *De jej.* 1–11 (SVC 6). It is known also to *Cat.* 786 (TEG 2.176). A parallel phenomenon for the transmission of Basil’s works is discussed in S.R. Holman, *The Hungry are Dying. Beggars and Bishops in Roman Cappadocia*, OSH (Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 101, in which she demonstrates that Ambrose drew on Basil’s sermon against usury.

between Basil's *Homily 1 on Fasting* and Chrysostom's *Homily 1 on Genesis*. There are three categories by which these parallels might be understood: shared conceptual formulations; shared biblical references and citations; adapted quotation.

TABLE 6 Parallels between Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 1.1–4 and Basil, *De jej.* 1.3–10

	Chrysostom (PG 53.23–26)	Basil (PG 31.164–184)
1	'Shall be gathering for this spiritual assembly' (κοινωνήσων ταύτης τῆς πνευματικῆς)	'A gathering of the grace of spirit ' (κοινωνίαν χαρίσματος πνευματικοῦ)
2	'The cause and institution of evils' (κακῶν αἰτία καὶ πρόξενος)	'Fasting was the institution of the legislation from above' (ἄνω μὲν ἡ νηστεία νομοθεσίας πρόξενος ἦν)
3	'That is saying, "Eat this, do not eat this ;" fasting is an image .' (τὸ δὲ λέγειν, τότε φάγε, καὶ τότε μὴ φάγη, νηστείας ἦν εἰκῶν [Gen 2,16–17])	'That is the " do not eat this " ... Fasting is an image ' (τὸ δὲ οὐ φάγεσθε ... νηστείας ἐστὶν εἰκῶν [Gen 2,16–17])
4	'The people sat eating and drinking, and they stood up jesting ' (ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν, καὶ πιεῖν, καὶ ἀνέστησαν παίζειν [Ex 32,6])	'The people sat eating and drinking, and they stood up jesting ' (ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν, καὶ πιεῖν, καὶ ἀνέστησαν παίζειν [Ex 32,6])
5	'The great Moses, of the legislation ' (ὁ μέγας Μωσῆς, τῆς νομοθεσίας)	'Of Moses, receiving the second legislation ' (Μωϋσῆς, δευτέραν λαμβάνων νομοθεσίαν)
6	'Again, others ... it was necessary from fasting ' (ἐτέρων πάλιν ... νηστείας ἐδεήθη)	'It was required of a second fast' (δευτέρας νηστείας προσεδεήθη)
7	'And fleeing from the tyranny of death' (καὶ τὴν τοῦ θανάτου τυραννίδα διαφυγῶν)	' They fled the threat of catastrophe' (διέφυγον τὴν ἀπειλὴν τῆς καταστροφῆς)
8	'The man of yearnings ' (ὁ ἀνὴρ δὲ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν [TH-Dan 9,23])	'The man of yearnings ' (ὁ ἀνὴρ δὲ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν [TH-Dan 9,23])
9	'The Ninevites ... preparing with human beings and the race of animals to receive this [fasting]' (Νινευῖται ... μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ἀλόγων γένος ταύτην ἐπιδείξασθαι παρασκευάσαντες)	'for the Ninevites , lest the animals had fasted' (Νινευῖταις εἰ μὴ καὶ τὰ ἄλογα συνενήστευσεν)
10	'Fasting is food of the soul ' (νηστεία γὰρ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐστὶ τροφή)	'Anger is drunkenness of the soul ' (θυμὸς μέθη ἐστὶ τῆς ψυχῆς)
11	'For even our Lord Jesus Christ undertook a fast for 40 days ... so that it would not be supposed that he arrived in appearance,	' By a fast , Our Lord [had] the flesh, which he took on , having fortified it ... and he taught us by fasting ... for it was inaccessible

TABLE 6 Parallels between Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 1.1–4 and Basil, *De jej.* 1.3–10 (*cont.*)

	Chrysostom (PG 53.23–26)	Basil (PG 31.164–184)
	not having taken on flesh ... (ὁ γὰρ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ αὐτὸς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμερῶν νηστεῖαν ἐπιδειξάμενος ... ἵνα γὰρ μὴ νομισθῇ δοκῇσῃ παραγεγενῆσθαι, καὶ μὴ ἀνειληφέναι σάρκα)	to him through the height of the godhead, so that he would not undergo necessity towards humanity' (ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν νηστεῖα τὴν σάρκα, ἣν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀνέλαβεν, ὀχυρώσας ... ἡμᾶς τε παιδεύων νηστείαις ... ἀπρόσιτος γὰρ ἦν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸ ὕψος τῆς θεότητος, εἰ μὴ διὰ τῆς ἐνδείας ὑπέβη πρὸς τὸ ἀνθρώπινον)
12	'Our outward human being wastes away, to this our inner human being is renewed' (ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται, τοσοῦτω ὁ ἔσω ἀνακαινύται [2 Cor 4,16])	'Our outward human being wastes away, to this our inner human being is renewed' (ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται, τοσοῦτω ὁ ἔσω ἀνακαινύται [2 Cor 4,16])
13	'For those who might get drunk ... woe to those coming' (Οἱ γὰρ μέθυσοι [1 Cor 6,10] ... Οὐαὶ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι [Am 6,3])	'Woe to those getting drunk' (Οὐαὶ οἱ μεθύοντες)

2.1 Shared Conceptual Formulations

The frequency of the parallels is notable, but the formulations above are too general to posit direct dependence of Chrysostom on Basil's *Homily 1 on Fasting* as a literary source. However, the specificity of their application in using biblical texts to illustrate a theological teaching on fasting indicates more than a generally shared linguistic milieu. For instance, Basil and Chrysostom call their audience to a 'spiritual fellowship' (κοινωνία + πνευματική). This is not remarkable except for the fact that both authors use the expression to refer to the liturgical commemoration of fasting. For Chrysostom, gluttony is an 'institution' (πρόξενος) of evil within the human race, while fasting is its remedy. For Basil, similarly, fasting is the 'institution' (πρόξενος) from above whereas gluttony is the institution from below. In another case, we see that for Basil and Chrysostom, Moses is a provider of legislation (νομοθεσία). While a generic term for the one who delivered the 10 commandments to Israel, here Basil and Chrysostom reference more precisely his twice receiving the law through the necessity of fasting. They use the same formulation to express this necessity, νηστεία + an aorist passive or middle form of δέω (with different prefixes).

They also express Old Testament events in similar terms. For Chrysostom, Elijah 'was fleeing' (διαφυγών) the tyranny of death through fasting; for Basil the Ninevites and their beasts 'fled' (διέφυγον) impending destruction. On this

point, both Basil and Chrysostom summarize the biblical text in the same way. After Jonah delivers his message, the king commands all men, beasts, cattle, and sheep not to eat or drink, using terms ‘beasts’ (κτῆνη), ‘oxen’ (βόες), and ‘sheep’ (πρόβατα). For the two pastors commemorating the practice of fasting, this means that in their repentance, the Ninevites brought fasting even to the ‘irrational’ animals (τὰ ἄλογα). Another notable shared formulation concerns Christology. They view the role of Christ here in the same way, as the culmination to the concatenation of biblical fasting exemplars. The fact that Christ participated in this practice just like Moses rebuts docetism. For Chrysostom it means that he did not assume flesh ‘in appearance’ (δοκήσει); for Basil, Christ, having fasted thus ‘fortified’ (ὀχυρώσας) our flesh. That he fasted confirms that he assumed flesh, which they both express through the ubiquitous formula σάρκα + ἀναλαμβάνω.²⁶ The notable terminology from Phil 2,7 brings us to another dimension of the similarities between the two homilies.

2.2 Shared Biblical Texts

Basil’s homily shares with Chrysostom’s a detailed framework of biblical texts for building up the spiritual importance of fasting. First, consider the common use of formulations derived from Amos 6 and 1 Cor 6,10, ‘Woe to those’. The mention of drunkenness, eating, or drinking in biblical texts is for these Church leaders a natural connection to their liturgical situation in which fasting was a priority. They spiritualize concepts of drinking and fasting in different but related ways. Drawing on 1 Cor 6,10, Basil says, ‘Woe to those who are drunk’

26 The formula is a regular feature of fourth-century Christological definitions, deriving from Phil 2,7. For instance, Theodoret, *Eran.* 1.68 (ETTLINGER, III) reports that Apollinarius explains the Incarnation with ἀνειληφέναι σάρκα. According to Athanasius, *Syn.* 27.3.12 (AW 2/1.255,16–17), it also occurs in the anathemas of the Synod of Ariminium, though as a formulation of the submission of the word to the flesh. Pagan detractors like the Emperor Julian criticized the notion that the divinity could take up a practice such as fasting. See the objection embedded in Theodore, *Adv. Iul.* fr. 3.2–3 (BTP 24.80): ‘But Moses, he says, having fasted 40 days received the law ... [So too, Elias] ... then what did Jesus receive after this fast?’ (ἀλλὰ Μωσῆς, φησὶν, ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα νηστεύσας ἔλαβε τὸν νόμον ... Ἰησοῦς δὲ τί μετὰ τὴν τοσαύτην νηστείαν ἔλαβεν). See discussion and contextualization in Cook, *Interpretation*, 318. Chrysostom was similarly concerned with the number of days, but brings up a potential objection in different terms: why did Christ not fast more days than his disciples, i.e. only forty days? Alexandrian authors discussed the number of 40 days as a signification of evil: Origen, *In Deut. ad* 25,3 (PG 12.816): ‘We note that the number 40 is always the embodiment of evil’ (ἀεὶ γε τετηρηκάμεν κακωτικὸν ὄντα τὸν μὲν ἀριθμὸν). This seems to be followed by the discussion of the flood in Didymus, *In Gen.* 190 (SC 244.112,10): ‘This very number is the embodiment of evil’ (ὁ ἀριθμὸς οὗτος κακωτικός ἐστίν); cf. Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 46c (TEG 15.95) / *Cat.* 719 (TEG 2.134).

(οὐαὶ οἱ μεθύοντες).²⁷ But he wishes to invest the idea of drunkenness with a different moral content than we might expect. To do so, he focuses on Jonah calling the Ninevites to repentance, which is also, as the text would have it, a call to fasting. From this vantage point, the movement of the soul (repentance) and of the body (fasting) are correlated. Thus, for Basil, the real intoxication to avoid is 'not that of wine' (οὐκ ἀπὸ οἴνου). 'Anger', he says, 'is drunkenness of the soul' (θυμὸς μέθη ἐστὶ τῆς ψυχῆς). Basil envisions anger as a spiritual form of drunkenness and with the biblical woe-formula, bids his audience to abstain from this passion as they would wine. Chrysostom reprises the same spiritualization of this idea, but in slightly different form: 'Fasting is the nourishment of the soul' (νηστεία γὰρ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐστὶ τροφή), just as drink is for the body.²⁸ 'Woe to those reclining with drink' (οὐαὶ οἱ πίνοντες), wording which closely resembles Amos 6,3, and woe to 'the drunkards' (οἱ γὰρ μέθυσοι), wording which closely resembles 1 Cor 6,10. As in Basil, Chrysostom uses an expression involving 'is of fasting' (ἐστὶ τῆς ψυχῆς) to identify fasting as a practice directly related to the soul.

Another common reference to biblical texts supports their construction of the spiritualization of fasting. In Ex 32,6, Moses castigates the Jewish people for having 'sat down' (ἐκάθισε) 'to eat and drink' (φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν) to their idol, the golden calf. Of course, this kind of eating is foil to what Basil wants to claim as the Christian practice of fasting, for it is actually 'gluttony' (γαστριμαργία) which leads 'to idolatry' (εἰς εἰδωλολατρείαν).²⁹ Chrysostom knows the liturgical-spiritualization of this biblical text in the same manner. For him Ex 32,6 is an indictment of 'gluttony' (ἀδηφαγία), which he connects to the original sin of Eve.³⁰ In Chrysostom's treatment, the prophetic texts of Ex 32,6 (and others) are directed at the anesthetized, ignorant, gluttonous Jews,³¹ who committed idolatry. In this light, Chrysostom and Basil share the same symmetrical

27 Basil of Caesarea, *De jej.* 1.10 (PG 31.181b).

28 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 1.4 (PG 53.25).

29 Basil of Caesarea, *De jej.* 1.5 (PG 31.169c).

30 On this point there occurs a notable parallel between Chrysostom and 1 Clement 3.1 (HOLMES, 48). Both cite Wis 2,24 and Dt 32,15 to explain the original sin as a combination of Satan's envy and Eve's indulgence. Their abbreviated citations of the Deuteronomy text differ: John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 1.3 (PG 53.24b): ἐλιπάνθη; 1 Clem 3.1 (HOLMES, 48): ἐπλατύνθη. In fact, both terms occur in the text Göttingen Dt 32,15 (VTG 3/2.349): ἐλιπάνθη, ἐπαχύνθη, ἐπλατύνθη. One may also note that Tertullian, *De jej.* 7–8 (CSEL 2.1260–1270) cites Ex 32,4 and Dt 32,15 as indictment of gluttonous Israel, citing Elisha, Daniel, and Christ as positive examples. The relationship between these texts and those of Basil, Chrysostom, and Rufinus merits further study.

31 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 1.4 (PG 53.25): Ἰουδαίοις διαλεγόμενος, τοῖς ἀναισθήτοις, τοῖς ἀγνώμοσι, τοῖς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν γαστριζομένοις.

reading of the law-giving pericope, namely that Moses receiving the law twice through fasting (Ex 24,18; 34,28) is the inversion of Israelite idolatry through gluttonous eating. We have already seen how they use similar formulations for this ‘necessity’ imposed on Moses, but it is a further connection that they view Moses’s fasting as a foil to Jewish idolatry.

Basil and Chrysostom use 2 Cor 4,16 in their magnification of fasting’s importance for the moral history of humanity and so for their congregation’s own lives. Paul’s distinction between the decay of ‘the outer man’ (ὁ ἔξω) and the renewal of ‘the inner man’ (ὁ ἔσω) for these Greek preachers applies to fasting. If one wants to make strong the ‘mind’ (νοῦν), says Basil, then subdue the ‘flesh’ (σάρκα) through fasting.³² That is what Paul means when he talks about the renewal of the inner man. He is renewed precisely because he has decayed the outer man. Chrysostom knows a similar distinction based on 2 Cor 4,16. The inner man, that ‘of soul’ (ψυχῆς), is fed through fasting, just as the ‘body’ (σῶμα) is fed through substantial food.³³

Basil and Chrysostom also similarly adduce biblical characters as examples of fasting. For instance, the prophet Daniel is the ‘man of yearnings’ (ὁ ἀνὴρ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν), a formulation found in the Theodotion version of Dan 9,23.³⁴ While this epithet was popular in Late Antique Christian authors for various purposes including personal *encomia*,³⁵ Basil and Chrysostom use it here in their homilies with the precise application to fasting, specifically that of Daniel. For them, Daniel’s zeal for fasting is correlated with the education of the beasts of the den into which Daniel was thrown. Chrysostom thinks that Daniel’s resolution

32 Basil of Caesarea, *De jej.* 1.9 (PG 31.180a).

33 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 1.4 (PG 53.25).

34 The LXX-Dan 9,23 (VTG 16/2.189) has ‘piteous’ (ἐλεεινός). According to Brown–Driver–Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, ad loc., the Theodotion rendering is closer to the sense of the underlying המודות. The entries in Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 524 and Liddel–Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 292 indicate that in classical and Patristic usage, ἐπιθυμία had a flexible connotation, being used either for negative sexual desire or yearning after a goal. Jerome, *Comm. In Proph. Dan.* pro. (PL 25.514) attests to the widespread use of Theodotion Daniel, with discussion in A.A. Di Lella, ‘The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel’, in J.J. Collins–P.W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, vol. 2, VTSup 83 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 602–604.

35 Following the Theodotion text, it is known to describe Daniel as early as Origen, *Comm. Rom.* 7.17 (PG 14.1147): *vir desideriorum*; see also Gregory of Nyssa, *De anima*, GNO 3/3.38,17: ‘Daniel was the approval of yearning’ (Δανιήλ ἔπαινος ᾧν ἡ ἐπιθυμία); its use in personal *encomia*, Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 18.1 (PG 35.985): ‘Basil is a man of yearnings’ ([Βασίλειος] ἀνὴρ ἐπιθυμῶν); *Or.* 11.1 (PG 35.832c): ‘Gregory is a man of yearnings’ ([Γρηγόριος] ἀνὴρ ἐπιθυμῶν).

to fast quells passion, or ‘bridles the wrath’ (θυμὸν ἐχαλίνωσε), of the lions;³⁶ Basil sees Daniel of a piece with Jonah—the man of yearnings ‘taught lions to fast’ (νηστεύειν ἐδίδαξε).³⁷ Another example is Eve. Both authors see her as the archetype of failed fasting, for in Gen 2,16–17 she received the command to abstain from food: ‘Do not eat’ (οὐ φάγεσθε), says the divine. The way Chrysostom and Basil explain Gen 2,16–17 brings us to consider adapted quotations in their respective homilies.

2.3 *Adapted Quotation*

Detailed comparison of their explanations of Gen 2,16–17 in this context illuminates a close relationship between Basil and Chrysostom. A comparative example from another Late Antique Christian homilist, Asterius of Amasea, shows that these formulations likely derive from a common source and not from direct dependence.

Basil ^a	Chrysostom ^b	Asterius ^c
<p>‘But that “Do not eat” is legislation for fasting and self-control ... But the way of life in paradise is an image of fasting, the human being is not only sharing in the manner of life of the angels’ (τὸ δὲ οὐ φάγεσθε, νηστείας ἐστὶ καὶ ἐγκρατείας νομοθεσία ... Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἐν παραδείσῳ διαγωγή νηστείας ἐστὶν εἰκὼν, οὐ μόνον καθότι τοῖς ἀγγέλοις ὁμοδιάτιος ὢν ὁ ἄνθρωπος).</p>	<p>‘But the saying “Eat this, but do not eat this” is an image of fasting ... this is the labor-less life, and that, just as an angel, so too being intertwined with the body does he lead a life on earth’ (τὸ δὲ λέγειν, τόδε φάγε, καὶ τόδε μὴ φάγῃς, νηστείας ἦν εἰκὼν ... τὸν ἀταλαίπωρον βίον ἐκείνον, καὶ ὅτι, καθάπερ ἄγγελος, οὕτω σώματι συμπεπλεγμένος διήγεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς).</p>	<p>Let us be illuminated, then, by the coming fast; for fasting is an image of the life to come, an imitation of the incorruptible life (φαιδρυνθῶμεν τοίνυν ἐπὶ τῇ μελλούσῃ νηστείᾳ· νηστεία τῆς μελλούσης ζωῆς εἰκὼν, τῆς ἀφθάρτου διαγωγῆς μίμημα).</p>

a Basil of Caesarea, *De jej.* 1.3 (PG 31.168a).

b John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 1.2 (PG 53.23–24).

c Asterius, *Hom.* 14.4.3 (DATEMA, 208,9–11).

36 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 1.3 (PG 53.24); this expression is ubiquitous from the Second Sophistic rhetor Maximus (2nd-century C.E.) into Byzantine literature, likely deriving from Sophocles, *Antig.* 476.

37 Basil of Caesarea, *De jej.* 1.7 (PG 31.173b).

There are three noteworthy elements from a comparison of these texts: exegetical approach, *similitudo*, and angelic life. Like Basil, Chrysostom isolates the biblical lemma with the construction ‘But this’ + ‘do not eat’ (τὸ δέ + οὐ φάγεσθε). The substantial neuter article identifies the expression in the text on which they wish to comment. Asterius does not envisage an exegesis of a biblical text here. After framing the exegetical approach in the same way, Chrysostom then, like Basil, uses a common rhetorical term to identify this biblical expression with the Christian practice of fasting. Both these authors state that ‘this [text] is an image of fasting’ (νηστείας ἐστὶν / ἦν εἰκὼν). Asterius joins them on these key identifications, suggesting a widespread knowledge of it and mitigating against the possibility that Basil is Chrysostom’s direct source, despite their nearly verbatim occurrence of some formulas. The use of *similitudo*, further, is a regular feature of Basil’s homilies.³⁸ The present application may be further contextualized in what Young has called moral allegorical exegesis,³⁹ where the particular case of Eve’s mandate to fast is universalized as an example for the Christian community. Finally, there is the common application of fasting to the life of the angels. All three homilists compared above believe this life to be shared by men in their condition on earth; common uses of ‘way of life’ (διαγωγὴ or διάγειν) express this idea.⁴⁰

Taken in isolation, any one of the three shared elements outlined in this section may be considered regular features of Late Antique Christian preaching and oratory. But compounded together, in conjunction with the use of the same biblical texts and many shared formulas, Basil’s *Homily 1 on Fasting* should be seen as depending on a similar resource, perhaps a *testimonium* and template,⁴¹ as that relied on in Chrysostom’s introduction to lent in his *Homily 1 on Genesis*.

3 Homilies on the Six Day Creation

In Chapter 5 of this volume, we saw that Chrysostom knew many of the formulations found in Syrian-Antiochene predecessors for explaining biblical texts.

38 W. Hengsber, *De ornatu rhetorico quem Basilius Magnus diversis homiliarum generibus adhibuit* (Bonn University diss., 1957), 120–122.

39 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 186–202, esp. 192, Type 4.

40 L. Brottier, *L’appel des «demi-chrétiens» à la «vie angélique»*. Jean Chrysostome prédicateur: entre idéal monastique et réalité mondaine, Patrimoines Christianisme (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2005), 371–375.

41 See Chapter 8.5 for discussion of the criteria used in assessing *testimonia* traditions, and the exploration of the question of Chrysostom’s use of such material in relation to Alexandrian authors.

Many of these concerned what may be understood as physical or natural phenomenon, such as in what manner the stars traverse the heavens or what kind of meat Noah is prohibited to eat. Presently, I demonstrate that Basil's *Homilies on the Six Day Creation* witness exegetical ideas that were available to Chrysostom in similar formulation. Basil delivered these nine sermons towards the end of his life and were almost immediately influential on other patristic authors, so it is consistent with other transmission phenomena pertaining to Basil's work that we might find common ground with John Chrysostom's attributed writings.⁴² We consider here the explanations of instantaneous creation, morning and evening, and the divine plural form.

3.1 *Instantaneous Creation*

Basil and Chrysostom understood the initial moment of creation to be instantaneous. There is considerable background to this idea. In his work *Against Eunomius*, Basil dealt with time as a complex philosophical and theological topic which impacted trinitarian theology.⁴³ In his *Six Day Creation*, he reprises some of these ideas. Dealing with the origin of creation and its initial events, the Greek text of Genesis confronted careful readers with a confusing assembly of temporal intervals, such as the 'beginning' referenced in Gen 1,1 or the first 'day' mentioned in Gen 1,5. One issue of particular difficulty was the possibility of an infinite regression of time. If the 'beginning' (ἀρχή) mentioned in the opening words of the bible signified a point within time, then what is the relationship between the onset of time and that of matter? Throughout his work, Basil insisted that God made the world and time to be coextensive with each other.⁴⁴ The beginning mentioned in Gen 1,1, then, is the beginning of both

42 For the discussion of the dating of Basil's *Homilies on the Six Day Creation*, which is generally supposed to be 378 or 379, see R. Van Dam, *Becoming Christian. The Conversion of Roman Cappadocia* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), esp. 211 n. 7. For Gregory of Nyssa's reception and response to Basil's *Six Day Creation*, with which he disagreed at several points, see D.C. DeMarco, 'The Presentation and Reception of Basil's *Homiliae in Hexaemeron* in Gregory's *In Hexaemeron*', *ZAC* 17.2 (2013) 332–352. Gregory of Nyssa, *In hex.* 1 (GNO 4/1.6,6–9) refers to Basil's *Six Day Creation* as 'the inspired study' (τὴν θεόπνευστον θεωρίαν). It is possible that Gregory wrote his own work on the creation as close to a year after the preaching of Basil's homilies.

43 M. DelCogliano, 'Basil of Caesarea versus Eunomius of Cyzicus on the Nature of Time: A Patristic Reception of the Critique of Plato', *VC* 68.5 (2014), 498–532.

44 Basil of Caesarea, *Eun.* 1.21 (SC 299.248): 'Rather, time is the extension coextensive with the existence of the cosmos' (χρόνος δέ ἐστι τὸ συμπαρεκτεινόμενον τῇ συστάσει τοῦ κόσμου διάστημα); *Hex.* 2.8 (GCS NF 2.35,18–19): 'Having established the nature of time, God set as measures and signs for it the intervals of the days [of creation]' (ὁ τὴν τοῦ χρόνου φύσιν κατασκευάσας Θεὸς, μέτρα αὐτῷ καὶ σημεία τὰ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐπέβαλε διαστήματα). The English

time and the world. In his *Homily 1 on the Six Day Creation*, Basil offers a clever framework with distinctive terminology for understanding this double-origin event depicted in Gen 1,1. For our purposes, there are three notable aspects.

First, there is the opposing view which Basil wishes to deny. It is the idea that things were produced by themselves or spontaneously (αὐτομάτως).⁴⁵ According to Basil, this is a view from Greek philosophy. He strictly denies it, for it fails to recognize God's power. Second, drawing on a rich tradition of Alexandrian Judeo-Christian reflection, inspired heavily by Septuagint-Wisdom literature, Basil says that this text depicts the 'instantaneous and timeless' (ἀκαριαῖον καὶ ἄχρονον) creation.⁴⁶ Basil thereby obviates the logical problem of infinite

translations and the paralleling of these two passages is established by DelCogliano, 'Basil of Caesarea versus Eunomius', 525–526 nos. 92, 94. He shows further that Basil's formulaic definition in *Eun.* 1.21 is indebted to Stoic and Middle Platonic discussions, witnessed especially in the fragments of Chrysippus.

45 Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 1.1 (GCS NF 2.1,9); see further discussion in J.C.M. Van Winden, *Arche: A Collection of Patristic Studies*, SVC 41 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 120–122; De Marco, 'The Presentation and Reception', 339.

46 Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 1.6 (GCS NF 2.11,15). This idea is discernible in the following Alexandrian authors: Philo, *Opif.* 12 (PAO 1.12,20–13,1): 'Immediately, at once by the first kind ... now at this time it has been made in part ... but not in one instantaneous moment' (εὐθὺς ἅμα τῇ πρώτῃ γενέσει ... νυνὶ μὲν γὰρ ἐν μέρει γίγνεται ... ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀθρόα καιρῶ ἐνί); Clement, *Strom.* 6.16.142.2 (GCS 52.504,9–11): 'after all things had been generated, at once the things created by thought ... the generation of each had been made' (ἀπάντων τῶν γενομένων, ἅμα νοήματι κτισθέντων ... ἡ ἐκάστου γένεσις ἀθρόως πεποιησθαι); Origen, *Cat.* 193 (TEG 1.134): 'all things have been made at once' (ὅφ' ἐν πάντα γεγονέναι); Didymus, *In Gen.* 23,5–8 (SC 233.68): 'For each thing was taken according to itself, as when instantaneously ... so even in the creation' (γὰρ καθ' ἑαυτὸ λαμβανόμενον ... ὡς ὅταν ἀθρόως ... οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς δημιουργίας); Gregory of Nyssa, *Hex.* 8–9 (GNO 4/1.17,16–17): 'timeless and gapless' (ἀκαρὲς τε καὶ ἀδιάστατον). For discussion of instantaneous creation and its background from the angle of Gregory of Nyssa, who gives a lengthy exposition of it based on the text of Gen 1,1, see Alexandre, 'L' exégèse', 162 and P.M. Blowers, *Drama of the Divine Economy: Creator and Creation in Early Christian Theology and Piety*, OECs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 146–147. Alexandre, *Commencement*, 99 points to Septuagint precedents for the 'instantaneous' terminology, such as that posed in LXX-Isa 48,13 (ἀθρόως, ὁμοῦ); New Testament expressions are studied in Daube, *The Sudden*, 12; 28–29; see Larcher, *Sagesse*, 111:688 for further discussion of such terminology in biblical literature. For the role of Wisdom literature in the 'timeless' creation conception, see M. Elliott, 'Wisdom of Solomon, Canon and Authority', in *StPatr* 63 (2013), 3–16 and J. Leemans, 'Athanasius and the Book of Wisdom', *ETL* 73.4 (1997), 349–368. For the Stoic and Epicurean background from which Philo draws for his own use of this idea, see F. Verde, *Elachista. La dottrina dei minimi nell'Epicureismo*, De Wolf-Mansion Centre, Series 1, 48 (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), esp. 202–205. Lampe, *Lexicon*, 86a suggests that in patristic literature, ἀθρόως is applied primarily to Trinitarian debates. The nuances of this term given by patristic authors were clearly more than this, not least in terms of cosmology.

regression: the biblical 'beginning' refers to the beginning of the 'road' of time, not to a point on the road itself.⁴⁷ He elaborates this idea throughout his *Six Day Creation* by a common expression regarding 'a single instant', such as that creation occurs 'by the single movement of God's will' (τῇ ῥοπῇ τοῦ θελήματος μόνῃ) or the stars are brought out 'in a timeless moment' (ἐν ἀκαριαίᾳ χρόνου ῥοπῇ).⁴⁸ Third, he draws on an atomic concept, well-known in Epicurean and Aristotelean philosophy. Basil understands the Genesis text to depict 'the tiniest moment, not according to part' (οὐδὲ μέρος αὐτοῦ τὸ ἐλάχιστον).⁴⁹ With this he denies that the opening lines of the bible refer to one of the constituent parts of the creation which is elaborated in the following verses.

Chrysostom witnesses these three elements with considerable precision of terminology. First, he addresses the problem of spontaneous creation. Producing the opinion of 'some people' (εἰσὶ τινες), he rejects the notion that created things are 'self-moving' (αὐτόματα),⁵⁰ a generic scientific term known since Aristotle and used in Christian theologies of creation to connote problematic views of a world governed by fate or atomic power and not providence.⁵¹ For John Chrysostom, such an opinion negates divine providence. Second, like Basil, Chrysostom says that the introductory lines of the bible depict creation 'not all things according to part' (οὐ πάντα κατὰ μέρος), meaning that the initial moment of creation is not envisioned as one part among the many.⁵² Rather, in Gen 1,1, Scripture 'teaches us that the substances of the elements were produced together' (τὰ συνεκτικώτατα τῶν στοιχείων ὑμᾶς διδάσκει). When the biblical text continues in 1,2 by mentioning the waters, this is not an account of the creation of the waters, as if it were a sequence. Finally, Chrysostom brings up the idea of the instantaneousness of creation. He does so when faced with Gen 1,5, which is the first mention in the biblical text of a temporal structure: 'there

47 Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 1.6 (GCS NF 2.11,17–18). DeMarco, 'The Presentation and Reception', 340.

48 Including those just mentioned: *ad Gn* 1,1: *Hex.* 1.2 (GCS NF 2.5); *ad Gen* 1,6: *Hex.* 3.7 (ibid., 50); *ad Gen* 1,11a: *Hex.* 5.5 (ibid., 77); *ad Gen* 1,11b: *Hex.* 5.6 (ibid., 77); *ad Gen* 1,14: *Hex.* 6.5 (ibid., 96–97); *ad Gen* 1,20: *Hex.* 7.1 (ibid., 113).

49 Verde, *Elachista* for the background of this concept, often referred to as the doctrine of the natural minima, in Epicurean thought and reception in later authors; Simplicius, *In Phys.* 1.4 (CAG 9.170,9–11) for reception in Late Antique Aristotelean commentary.

50 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 3.3 (PG 53.35).

51 For instance, in a passage arguing the thesis that the sea does not have sources (πηγάς), Aristotle, *Meteor.* 353b 28 (LCL, 126) states that spring water and rivers 'run of their own accord' (αὐτόματα ῥεῖ). The passage is paraphrased negatively and refuted in Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 4.3 (GCS NF 2.60,6–9). See Chapter 5.2.1 in this volume of the connection between *automata* and astrological fate in patristic exegesis.

52 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 3.1 (PG 53.33).

was one day'. Chrysostom was evidently familiar with expressions that were common to Basil, as he says that God's creative activity could have occurred in a single instant (ἐν ἀκαριαίᾳ ῥοπῇ).⁵³ Chrysostom applies this to the light and day mentioned in Gen 1,3–5. He does not adopt the philosophical position of Basil on the nature of time and its beginning, but the two witness shared terminology and concerns to address the idea that Gen 1,1 is one point within the enumeration of created elements.

It is notable that Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore explain the original creation event in different ways.⁵⁴ From the perspective of Chrysostom's Antiochene predecessors, this notion of instantaneousness overcomplicated the sequence of the biblical text. Key to Eusebius of Emesa's argument was the version of the Genesis text found in the Aquila recension, which instead of 'in the beginning' read 'instantaneously' (ἀθρόως). Eusebius of Emesa says that for Greek speakers this really means 'in the head' (ἐν κεφαλαίῳ) or 'in short' (ἐν συντόμῳ):⁵⁵ it is a summative statement of what follows. Gregory and Basil were aware of this interpretation and its source in the *recentiores*.⁵⁶ But for the Cappadocians, Aquila's wording was a justification for their philosophical notion of instantaneousness. The Emesene and his follower Diodore could not go so far. Instead, the variants restricted Gen 1,1 to the sense of a summary of the contents of the creation. Further, Diodore appears to address the idea that God did not create things according to part. 'This "in the beginning"', testifies a fragment from the *Collectio Coisliniana*, 'clearly teaches that the remaining elements were produced after this [μετὰ ταῦτα]'.⁵⁷ Such a statement denies the view found in Chrysostom and Basil. Chrysostom does not so much explicitly

53 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 3.3 (PG 53.35).

54 The Alexandrian position seems to be repeated, however, in Theodore, *Frag. Gen.* 1 (SACHAU, 8.20): 'at one time' (بِأَمْرٍ وَاحِدٍ).

55 Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 10 (TEG 1.8.1) / *Comm. Gen.* 1f (TEG 15.26): 'in the head' (ἡ κεφαλή) or 'in short' (ἡ συντομία). In retaining the translation 'the head', I follow ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 157. This *catena* fragment should be used with caution as it is only found in Type III, and at points disagrees with the Armenian. The use of this Greek fragment of Eusebius in Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad* 1,1 (GCS NF 22.11,24–28) does not yield the ἐν συντόμῳ reading. Diodore's surviving comments on 'in the beginning' do not appear to engage the variant readings brought up by Eusebius. See Diodore, *Coisl.* 5 (CCSG 15.5).

56 Alexandre, *Commencement*, 99; ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 168–169; Ch. Köckert, *Christliche Kosmologie und kaiserzeitliche Philosophie: die Auslegung des Schöpfungsberichtes bei Origenes, Basilios und Gregor von Nyssa vor dem Hintergrund kaiserzeitlicher Timaeus-Interpretationen*, STAC 56 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 325–348.

57 Diodore, *Coisl.* 5,11–13 (CCSG 15.5). Gennadius, *Coisl.* 6 (CCSG 15.6) attacks directly the Alexandrian position of instantaneous creation, showing that some Antiochenes opposed it.

reject his predecessors as he tends to side with the terminology and ideas represented in other sources, sources shared by Basil.

3.2 *Evening and Morning*

The study of how to mark the significance of specific intervals of time in the creation account of Genesis brought up another issue which Basil and Chrysostom discuss similarly. It concerned how the day-night cycle worked. In Gen 1,16, the sun is created. What follows is the clarification that with this comes the distinction between ‘morning’ (πρωϊ) and ‘evening’ (ἑσπέρα). A potential contradiction arose here, for light and day seem to have already been created in verses 3–5. Indeed, after the creation of light, the text states that there has passed the ‘first day’ (ἡμέρα μία), presumably involving morning and evening. For Basil, the whole problem is explainable from the fact that the ‘first day’ mentioned prior to the creation of the sun implicitly describes the cycle of morning and evening. The creation of the sun in Gen 1,16, with the language of ‘morning and evening’, is merely a clear depiction of this cycle. Echoing the idea of a synecdoche, particularly that found in Chrysostom’s own (see Chapter 4.2.3.3 in this volume), Basil says that ‘the name for the whole’ is given ‘to the more dominant part’ (τῷ ἐπικρατοῦντι τὴν πᾶσαν προσηγορίαν). He adds that day begins with the light of the sun, and the night begins with the darkness. Between these two is a ‘division’ (ὀρισθέν); ‘their nature does not mix’ (ἄμικτον αὐτῶν τὴν φύσιν).⁵⁸

Eusebius of Emesa has a slightly different take on this matter. He witnesses a debate with a philosopher regarding the relationship of ‘the first day’ (where the sun is produced) to the substances of the heaven and the firmament.⁵⁹ Chrysostom, on the other hand, knows a discussion about temporal distinction between day and night closely related to that of Basil. On the division of

⁵⁸ Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 2.7 (GCS NF 2.34,2, 10, 21–22).

⁵⁹ Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 6b–c (TEG 15.35). Eusebius’s ‘philosophers’ (φιη|ηun-ψω|ηpύ) believed that the sun ‘constitutes’ (υνῶ|η|η) a day, meaning that the day is not its own separate ‘substance’ (υνῶ|η|η|η). Eusebius says that this mocks the Scriptures. Gen 1,16 shows that the sun is produced separately from the ‘first day’, mentioned in Gen 1,5. The ensuing argumentation concerns the relationship of the sun to the heaven and the firmament. Eusebius of Emesa does not thereby deal with the potential contradiction of Gen 1,5 and 1,16 from the vantage point of day and night as a single cycle. Eusebius of Emesa may derive this discussion from his teacher, as we find in Eusebius of Caesarea, *Comm. Ps. ad* 73,16 (PG 23.864) the problem of day and night discussed in relation to the firmament and the heaven. There is further background to this witnessed in Origen, *Hom. in Ps. LXXIII* 3,2 (GCS NF 19.253,16): ‘the creation of day and night are not separate’ (οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἄλλος δημιουργός ἐστιν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός).

morning and evening, he says, identifying the key issue brought up in Basil's *Homily 2 on the Six Day Creation*, Scripture 'teaches us precisely' (ἀκριβείας ἡμᾶς διδάσκει).⁶⁰ The 'first day' mentioned in Gen 1,3–5 'refers to the whole' (τὸ πᾶν προσαγορεύων), the cycle of morning and evening mentioned explicitly in Gen 1,16. This same expression was used in Basil's theory that the name derives from the more dominant part of the two-fold cycle which Gen 1,16 describes in detail. Basil also stated that natures of day and night do not mix but rather compose one ordered cycle. Chrysostom invokes the same idea when he exhorts his audience, 'let us not confuse the order' (μὴ συγχέωμεν τὴν τάξιν) of the two.⁶¹

In what context ought we to understand these remarks? Chrysostom casts this discussion as a clarification of a matter brought up by some 'quarrelling Jews' (φιλονεικεῖν Ἰουδαῖοι).⁶² Apparently, they held that the evening is the beginning of the following day. A passage from Theodore of Mopsuestia's *Commentary on John* illuminates what is at stake here. Marking an evening as the beginning of the following day makes sense of a potential incoherency between the biblical text and a liturgical practice. Theodore seeks to align the resurrection of Christ with the sabbath day. As his text of Mt 28,1 suggests, the period after the resurrection is marked with the expression 'on which the first day of the week dawned'.⁶³ Theodore thereby takes this expression to mean that light rose 'on the evening of the sabbath day' (ܐܬܬܝܬ ܠܝܠܬܝܢ ܕܝܠܕܝܬܝܢ).⁶⁴ For Theodore, the new day, the dawn of the resurrection, had to begin on the sabbath. While this makes sense by way of aligning the resurrection with the sabbath day, his cosmic-temporal markings go against the plain sense of the Genesis text. It is thereby possible that Theodore is Chrysostom's Jew. But more importantly for our purposes, this parallel passage illustrates that a considerably nuanced culture of debate existed for Late Antique Christian exegetes around the problem of marking the day and the night, and that Chrysostom was familiar with a discussion similar to that of Basil, against

61 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 5.5 (PG 53.53).

62 Ibid.

63 Theodore's text reads ܐܬܬܝܬ ܠܝܠܬܝܢ ܕܝܠܕܝܬܝܢ. It is to be recalled that Theodore's original work was commenting on the Greek which reads 'at the dawn of the first day of the week' (τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσης εἰς μίαν σαββάτων). The word 'to add / increase' (ܐܬܬܝܬ) is omitted from the Matthean Peshitta.

64 Theodore, *Comm. Jo.* 7, ad 20,1 (CSCO 115.343,11–16). He appears to hold the opposite position, that the evening is the beginning of night, from the perspective of the scholia, Theodore *apud* Theodore bar Koni, *Scol.* 1 (CSCO 65.28,21–25): ܐܬܬܝܬ ܠܝܠܬܝܢ ܕܝܠܕܝܬܝܢ ܕܝܠܕܝܬܝܢ.

those of his fellow Antiochenes. Paradoxically, here, in restating the clear, plain sense of the Genesis text, Chrysostom engages in a complex matter of exegesis.

3.3 *The Royal Plural*

Basil and Chrysostom shared exegetical strategies for discussing the divine first-person plural found in Gen 1,26, 'let us make' (ποιήσωμεν). Reported by the rabbis as one of the altered passages from the original translation of the Torah into Greek,⁶⁵ this text became a site of theological dispute for Jewish, Christian, and pagan authors in Late Antiquity.⁶⁶ The question, of course, concerns the identities of the presumed plural persons, and in what ways they relate as addressee and addresser. To give a taste of the capacity of this text for controversy, by the mid-fourth-century, the subject of this address had become so problematic that at the council of Sirmium 351, non-Christocentric interpretations of Gen 1,26 were rejected as anathema. The council saw fit to deem specific viewpoints off-limits and condone only one interpretation. As Athanasius preserves it, in this view the ποιήσωμεν of Gen 1,26 encapsulated 'the Father speaking to the Son, not to himself' (τὸν πατέρα πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν λέγειν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν).⁶⁷ Indeed, Young was right to remark that in principle, exegesis in doctrinal controversy cannot be regarded as different than that in homily and commentary.⁶⁸

For our purposes there are three noteworthy aspects to Basil's handling of this problem. First, he addresses what he describes as a Jewish (Ἰουδαϊκόν) view-

65 E. Tov, 'The Rabbinic Tradition Concerning the 'Alterations' Inserted into the Greek Translation of the Torah and their Relation to the Original Text of the Septuagint', in *Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, VTSup 72 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1–20.

66 For overviews of patristic exegetical traditions, see R.M. Wilson, 'The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. 1:26', *StPatr* 1 (Berlin, 1957), 420–437; Alexandre, *Commencement*, 173, and Harl, *Genèse*, 95–96; for John Chrysostom's exegetical context, G.V. Gillard, 'God in Gen. 1:26 according to Chrysostom', *Studia Biblica* 1 (1978), 149–156, and S.A. Pomeroy, 'Representing the Jews: John Chrysostom's Use of Exegetical and Theological Traditions for Gen 1:26a (*In Gen. hom.* 8)', in G. Roskam–J. Verheyden (eds.), *Light on Creation: Ancient Commentators in Dialogue and Debate on the Origin of the World*, STAC 104 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 111–113. Emperor Julian supposed that Gen 1,26 is 'stylized' after Plato; see Riedweg, 'Julians Exegese der Rede des Demiurgen' and Cook, *Interpretation*, 302–303.

67 Athanasius, *Syn.* 27.14 (AW 2/1.255). This council, known especially for its anti-Photinian formula, sought to prohibit the identification of the Father and the Son more generally, so it is not surprising to see the anathema in this context. See the reception and comment on the formula in Hilary, *De syn.* 38–61 (PL 10.509–622) with discussion in M. Weedman, *The Trinitarian Theology of Hilary of Poitiers*, SVC 89 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 97.

68 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 246.

point. Runia showed that this is a polemical device. By labelling the opinion he is about to unfold as Jewish, Basil could take aim at what he considered to be a Christian heretical group, namely the followers of Aetius and Eunomius, generally held to be the inheritors of a subordinationist or Arian teaching, whose theology Basil addressed throughout his career.⁶⁹ Second, according to Basil this Jewish view held that the verb of Gen 1,26 references ‘countless’ (μυρίους) subjects. This view thereby takes the addressee of ‘Let us make’ to be the myriad ‘angels’ (ἄγγελοι) or servants who ‘have stood by’ (παρεστῶσιν) and are thus ‘worthy of his counsel’ (συμβουλῆς ἄξιωμα).⁷⁰ This is grounded in a legitimately Jewish position, as both Philo and Midrash Bereshit Rabbah offer the interpretations that in Gen 1,26 God addressed his ‘co-workers’ (συνεργῶν), the angels, and other options.⁷¹ But in what comes next it is clear that Basil really does envision what in his mind was a Christian heretical group. He identifies that based on this text one could conclude that the Father and the Son are ‘dissimilar’ (ἀνόμοιον), viewing the son as ‘the creation’ (τὸ πλάσμα).⁷² For Basil, then, the text must reference the Son as a co-equal addressee. He explains that the Son and the Father ‘are the same form’ (τὴν αὐτὴν εἶναι μορφὴν), which is ‘in the character of the godhead’ (ἐν τῷ ἰδιώματι τῆς θεότητος).⁷³ This went directly against the line of logic adopted by the Anomoeans or Heterousian group, much of which was inspired by Eunomius. In the view of Eunomius, the divine was without source, cause, or ontological precedent. He could not have a Son as an emanation from his essence.⁷⁴ It made sense, therefore, for the addressee of Gen 1,26 to be an inferior. But for Basil, there is no inferiority envisaged here because by nature the Son and Father possess the same form of Godhead.

69 D.T. Runia, “‘Where, Tell Me, is the Jew ...?’: Basil, Philo and Isidore of Pelusium”, *VC* 46 (1992), 176–180.

70 Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 9.6 (GCS NF 2.160,15–18).

71 Philo, *Opif.* 75 (PAO 1.25,14–15); *Bereshit Rabbah* 8.3.1 (THEODOR–ALBECK I:307–308; BJS 104.76); 8.4.2 (ibid., 309–310; 78); cf. Runia, ‘Where is the Jew’, 176–179 for the views of Philo and the Rabbis. Awareness of similar views had already entered the Christian exegetical stream by Justin, *Dial.* 62.2 (PAR 47/1.350): ‘to himself’ (πρὸ ἑαυτόν), ‘to the elements’ (πρὸς τὰ στοιχεῖα), ‘another rational being by number’ (ἄριθμῷ ὄντα ἕτερον καὶ λογικὸν ὑπάρχοντα). Justin presents the last view as faithful to Moses. With Ps 109,3, Prov 8,22 and Col 1,15 he affirms that it is the λόγος.

72 Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 9.6 (GCS NF 2.160,7).

73 Ibid., GCS NF 2.159,25–26.

74 R.P. Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, OECs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 249. For further discussion of Eunomian views of causality, see M.R. Barnes, ‘Eunomius of Cyzicus and Gregory of Nyssa: Two Traditions of Transcendent Causality’, *VC* 52 (1998), 59–87.

Framing his exegesis of Gen 1,26 with the metaphor of searching each tiny letter for the depth of hidden meaning,⁷⁵ Chrysostom knows the three dimensions to Basil's argumentation. First, Chrysostom identifies that an opposing viewpoint is at stake in this text. We are dealing, he says, with the positions of 'the Arians' (τὰ Ἀρείου),⁷⁶ but let us also 'discuss [this teaching] correspondently with the Jews' (Ἰουδαίους καταλλήλως διαλεγόμενοι).⁷⁷ The same polemical device as that found in Basil is in place. Second, he deals with the specific opinion that Gen 1,26 refers to an 'angel' (ἄγγελον) who 'shares the counsel' (κοινωνεῖν γνώμης) of the Lord. This is confused, Chrysostom thinks, because angels only 'are standing' (παρεστάναι) in wait for service and would never be admitted to the most venerable of counsels.⁷⁸ Similar linguistic formulations in Basil and Chrysostom are thereby applied to the same problem, but they are slightly different. For instance, Basil uses συμβουλή where Chrysostom uses γνώμη to explain the view that the royal plural refers to an angel who shared a kind of council with the divine. Also, they explain the action of the angels with similar terminology, 'to stand near' (παραστατεῖν) or 'to stand by' (παραστῆναι) in waiting around the Lord. Finally, Chrysostom addresses a theological discussion in line with Basil's views in the *Homily 9 on the Six Day Creation* here discussed. For Chrysostom, to hold that Gen 1,26 refers to an angel implies that the Son is 'less according to the essence' (ἐλάττωι κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν) of the Father. Basil's concern about subordination and dissimilarity, characteristic of Heterousian positions, recurs here. Then, Chrysostom produces a similar strategy for responding to this problem. Whereas Basil said that the Son and the Father have the same form, for Chrysostom it is that they possess 'likeness of being' (οὐσίας τὴν ὁμοιότητα). Strictly speaking, of course, this is not the same thing, but the expressions likely indicate related traditions of Homoian explanations of the divine essence. In his work *Against Eunomius*, which was representative of this theological tradition, Basil argues that whereas Eunomius held the Son to be like a 'work of art' (τέχνης ἔργον), he is in fact 'the exact similarity in the same being' (ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ οὐσίᾳ τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον).⁷⁹ Chrysostom reflected this distinctive but versatile 'exact similarity'

75 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 8.1 (PG 53.70); see Chapter 2 for contextualization of this metaphor in the *Homilies on Genesis*.

76 *Ibid.*, 8.3 (PG 53.72).

77 *Ibid.*, 8.4 (PG 53.73); cf. John Chrysostom, *Serm. Gen.* 2.2 (SC 433.188,99–190,101) which uses the same formulas.

78 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 8.2 (PG 53.71); see further detailed comparison in Pomeroy, 'Representing the Jew', 110.

79 Basil of Caesarea, *Eun.* 1.18 (SC 299.236,8–9). This expression τὸ ἀπαράλλακτως was for Basil related to the formulaic 'alike according to essence' (τὸ ὅμοιον κατ' οὐσίαν), as when the two

(ἀπαράλλακτον) terminology, applied to the question of divine essence, in one of his catechetical lectures from Antioch.⁸⁰ In his *Homily 8 on Genesis* considered here, Chrysostom approaches the question of essence also from the angle of a comparative structure, rejecting the view that the Son is 'lesser' than the Father. This too belongs within Homoian traditions. Epiphanius witnesses George of Laodicea rejecting the Heterousian viewpoint that the 'Son is lesser from generation' (ὁ δὲ Υἱὸς ἐλάττων γενέσεως),⁸¹ and indeed Eunomius himself affirmed precisely this point, namely that the Son 'is lesser, as a creature' (ἐλάττων ἐστὶν ὡς ποίημα).⁸² Chrysostom thereby espouses a firmly Homoian stance on the relationship between the Father and the Son, confirming Lai's argument that the Meletian group supported by Basil's early work influenced Chrysostom's trinitarian theology.⁸³ Terminology used by Basil late in his life continued to resonate with the concerns of the Greek preacher nearly a decade later.

are placed side-by-side. Compare Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 9.3 (COURTONE 1:39,11–14) and Gregory of Nyssa, *Ref. conf. Eun.* 158 (GNO 2/2.379): 'The son is like the father' (ὅμοιός ἐστιν ὡς υἱὸς πατρί). This homoian formulation was adapted into the creedal confession of the Synod of Antioch 363, as reported by Socrates, *Eccl. hist.* 3.25.14 (GCS NF 1.226,22): 'like to the Father according to the essence' (ὅμοις κατ' οὐσίαν τῷ Πατρί). This was Basil's compromise interpretation of the Nicene ὁμοούσιον, aimed at procuring the support of Athanasius, discussed in Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 332.

- 80 John Chrysostom, *Cat.* 1.21.2–3 (SC 50.119): 'having exact similarity with regard to being' (ἀπαράλλακτον ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁμοιότητα); see discussion in Lai, 'The Eusebian and Meletian Roots', 56. Asterius had used ἀπαράλλακτος as a key term to express his 'participative' understanding of the Son as the image of God, which Eusebius of Caesarea cautiously affirms but does not adopt fully. Acacius, the successor of Eusebius of Caesarea, would go on to defend Asterius's idea in the Dedication Council of Antioch 341, but with the terminology of 'impress' (ἐκμαγεῖον). See M. DelCogliano, 'Eusebian Theologies of the Son as the Image of God before 341', *JES* 14.4 (2006), 475–478 and 468–469 for ἀπαράλλακτος in Philo and Origen. Ἀπαράλλακτος is used to explain how the son is the image of the father also in John Chrysostom, *In Col. hom.* 3 (EP 5.201E); cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech. hom.* 11.18 (PG 33.713) which places in parallel 'similar' (ὅμοιος) and 'exactly similar' (ἀπαράλλακτοι).
- 81 George of Laodicea, *Ep. apud* Epiphanius, *Pan.* 73.21 (GCS 37.293–294); the location of George within the Homoian group is discussed in DelCogliano, 'The Literary Corpus', 687–688.
- 82 Eunomius, *Apol.* 26.11 (VAGGIONE, 68–70).
- 83 Lai, 'The Eusebian and Meletian Roots', 45. Regarding Basil of Caesarea's influence on Meletian theology, it is best to speak of his early career involvement in the Synod of Antioch 362–363 and the writing of *Against Eunomius* around that time.

4 Conclusion

Based on the accumulation of evidence regarding Chrysostom's shared formulations with Basil in the context of specific applications to biblical texts, Basil should be viewed as sharing sources with John Chrysostom, or, at most, a source of inspiration for successful ideas to explain and illuminate biblical texts. A considerable amount of parallels between *Homily 1 on Genesis* and *Homily 1 on Fasting* illustrates this ambiguity. While they shared many formulas, some with striking precision, and a string of biblical text citations, many of these elements are found elsewhere in other Late Antique Christian authors—the parallel with Asterius showed that speaking about fasting as an 'image' was not localized to Chrysostom and Basil. The concentration of all these elements, however, in two homilies on fasting during Lent by two different preachers in similar historical contexts suggests dependence on the same source.

We also considered the rather obvious possibility that Chrysostom had access to the *Homilies on the Six Days of Creation*. There is no evidence that he used this work directly. But several notable exegetical and theological traditions emerged as common points between the two. Basil and Chrysostom share a similar strategy for addressing the potential contradiction between the creation of the day and the temporal boundaries of nature, or the Neo-Arian viewpoint that the Son is creature based on Gen 1,26. In appropriating the famous idea of the instantaneous creation, Chrysostom produces terminology close to that of Basil, but it is by no means a foregone conclusion that in this Basil's *Homily 1 on the Six Days of Creation* was Chrysostom's literary source. Whatever Chrysostom's precise source on this matter, this case illustrates the conjunction of doctrinal controversy and biblical exegesis, and how Chrysostom appealed to technical theological terminology to create a clear teaching for his audience.

Another notable feature of the parallels between Chrysostom and Basil's *Creation* work is that other Antiochene authors responded negatively to several of their shared ideas. For the explanation of day and night, Eusebius of Emesa takes up a different issue than Basil and Chrysostom. In this case, further, it is possible that Chrysostom found the viewpoint of Theodore problematic, relying on a tradition shared with Basil to reject Theodore's division of day and night. Similarly, Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa seem to deny explicitly that Gen 1,1 can refer to a timeless event: the 'in the beginning' is simply a summary of what is to come. Similar observations were made regarding Basil's *Homily 1 on Fasting*. In his own introduction to Lent, Chrysostom follows closely the structure found in Basil's work, in addition to formulations regarding how to explain various biblical *exempla* of fasting, such as the education of the 'beasts' of Nineveh or the 'need' of Moses to fast in order to 'twice' receive the law.

An important exception emerges with *Letter 260*, Basil's correspondence with Optimus of Antioch. Chrysostom reproduces a rather complicated and fine series of distinctions regarding the speculative tradition of the sins of Cain. A rich dossier of patristic exegesis on this tradition survives, enabling close comparison between authors. It is remarkable that Diodore, Chrysostom's teacher, produced a list and that Chrysostom agrees one hundred percent with that of Basil, measured against only several agreements with Diodore. As texts intended for public use, then, Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* demonstrate moments of considerable learning and source adaptation. At the same time, they subtly express independence from his direct predecessors, suggesting a scholastic exegetical culture with wide and developed resources was at his disposal or undergirds the composition of the *Homilies on Genesis* in the form that we have them.

This capacity for precise adoption of sources and various exegetical terminologies from other leading figures of Chrysostom's day nuances our understanding of his envisioned priorities in the pulpit. He often invoked, even if briefly, well-tested pedagogical resources for biblical and theological exegesis. Further, his non-literal readings and aggadic interpretations are not independent speculation but based on previous models. To illustrate further the complex variety of resources at his disposal through his involvement in patristic exegetical culture, we turn to consider a figure that was influential on both Eusebius of Emesa and Basil, namely Eusebius of Caesarea.

John Chrysostom and Eusebius of Caesarea

Recent increased attention to the role of Eusebius of Caesarea in the development of fourth-century biblical exegesis raises the question of how John Chrysostom may be situated in relation to this figure.¹ Eusebius is well studied for his works of historiography and apologetics,² and it has been shown that John Chrysostom used Eusebius's *Preparation for the Gospel* as a source for aspects of his own apologetic enterprise.³ The question of Eusebius's influence in the realm of biblical exegesis, then, is a natural extension of an already established trajectory of influence. There are further historical reasons for supposing that Eusebius of Caesarea informed John Chrysostom's biblical exegesis. Socrates records that Eusebius of Emesa, Chrysostom's exegetical 'grandfather' by way of Diodore, studied under Eusebius of Caesarea.⁴ From the perspective of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis*, is there any discernible inheritance of this lineage? I shall demonstrate that John Chrysostom displays awareness of some of the Caesarean's typological and theophanic exegetical strategies. These occur against the backdrop of Eusebius of Caesarea's wider impact on early Christian literature, which for our present purposes may be understood within the realms of trinitarian theological exegesis, apologetic exegesis, and scholarly tools.⁵

- 1 See A.P. Johnson–J. Schott, *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*, HS 60 (Cambridge, MA: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2013); S. Inowlocki–C. Zamagni (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius. Collected Papers on Literary, Historical, and Theological Issues*, SVC 107 (Leiden: Brill, 2011). Of these, 6 chapters, most in the latter volume, are devoted to his biblical exegesis and scholarly tools.
- 2 T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge (MA–London: Harvard University Press, 1981); E. des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée commentateur. Platonisme et Écriture sainte*, ThHist 63 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1982); S. Morlet, *La Démonstration évangélique d'Eusèbe de Césarée. Étude sur l'apologétique chrétienne à l'époque de Constantin*, EAA 187 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009).
- 3 S.A. Pomeroy, 'Reading Plato through the Eyes of Eusebius: John Chrysostom's *Timaeus* Quotations in Rhetorical Context', in Mayer–de Wet (eds.), *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, 464–492 and further S. Morlet, 'La source principale du *Quod Christus sit Deus* attribué à Jean Chrysostome: la *Démonstration évangélique* d'Eusèbe de Césarée', *REAug* 58.2 (2012), 261–285.
- 4 Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.9.3 (GCS NF 1.98,14–16); see further Winn, *Eusebius of Emesa*, 3 n. 5.
- 5 Compare discussions on the development of Eusebius's exegetical and theological trajectory in M.J. Hollerich, 'Eusebius as Polemical Interpreter of Scripture', in W.H. Attridge–G. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, Studia Post Biblica 42 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 585–586 and *ibid.*, 'Eusebius' *Commentary on the Psalms* and its Place in the Origins of Christian Bibli-

First, some of Eusebius of Caesarea's contributions to the biblical exegetical debates of his time pertained directly to trinitarian theology. He is known to have impacted the work of later authors. One case occurs when Basil followed Eusebius in using variant bible readings of Prov 8,22 to address what they understood as the Marcellan position that the Son was indistinct from the Father prior to creation.⁶ This is a significant case not only because of the relevance of this text to the Arian disputes as a fundamental intertextual resource,⁷ but because throughout his career Eusebius changed his mind about the meaning of precisely this biblical text. While in an early work like the *Prophetic Extracts* he claimed that the Son was inferior in essence to the Father, in the

cal Scholarship', in Johnson-Schott (eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea*, 159. In the latter, Hollerich suggests that the most distinctive features of Eusebius's exegetical production are his use of philological methods and his interest in literary questions and topics. In this he follows Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 164: 'Eusebius was by instinct and training a scholar; he became an apologist only because circumstances demanded that he do so, and his style of argument in apology and polemic continually betrays the biblical exegete'. This is also the view of C. Curti, 'L'esegesi di Eusebio di Cesarea: caratteri e sviluppo', in *Le trasformazioni della cultura nella Tarda Antichità. Atti del Convegno tenuto a Catania, Università degli Studi, 27 Sett.-2 Ott. 1982*, vol. 1 (Rome: Jouvence, 1985), 459-478. Another discussion comes via C. Zamagni, 'Eusebius' Exegesis between Alexandria and Antioch: Being a Scholar in Caesarea (a Test Case from *Questions to Stephanos 1*)', in Inowlocki-Zamagni (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius*, 152; 169-170. Drawing on Sant, Zamagni upholds the basic structure of a four-step development of Eusebius's exegesis: Origen (*Prophetic Excerpts*); historical facts and apologetics (*Demonstration on the Gospel*); philological competence in the face of theological adversaries (*Against Marcellus* and *Ecclesiastical Theology*); maturity of historical exegesis (*Commentary on Isaiah* and *on the Psalms*). Zamagni demands that Eusebius's adoption of Origen's material be seen as more pervasive and difficult to categorize than merely an initial phase.

- 6 M. DelCogliano, 'Basil of Caesarea on Proverbs 8:22 and the Sources of Pro-Nicene Theology', *JThS* 59.1 (2008), 183-190. Eusebius understood Marcellus' theology to be based on the notion of Logos proceeding and returning to the Father. In Eusebius's view, Marcellus therefore denied the preexistent distinction between the Father and the Son and supposed that in the end the Son would be subsumed within the Father as a spoken word returning to its source in the human mind. S. Parvis, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy (325-345)*, OPCS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 182, has cautioned this as a misrepresentation. Lienhard, 'The Exegesis of 1 Cor 15, 24-28', 343-344 has shown that Eusebius responded to some of Marcellus' exegesis directly. For discussion of the extent to which Eusebius has binitarian theological tendencies, a good starting point is V.H. Drecoll, 'How Binitarian/Trinitarian was Eusebius?', in Johnson-Schott (eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea*, 289-305, who considers whether Eusebius neglected to discuss the Holy Spirit in his theology, showing that in a few passages he does, in fact, integrate the Holy Spirit in his divine and cosmic hierarchy.
- 7 See S. Ticciati, 'Proverbs 8:22 and the Arian Controversy', in K.J. Dell-W. Kynes (eds.), *Reading Proverbs Intertextually* (London: Bloomsbury, 2019), 179-190.

passage from *Ecclesiastical Theology* which influenced Basil, Eusebius claims that Prov 8,22 demonstrates that the Son had a peculiar affinity with the Father and possessed the attribute of preexistence.⁸

Related to these theological shifts in the work of Eusebius is a second broader contribution on the landscape of fourth-century Christian literature, namely the nexus between theology, exegesis, and apologetics. The *Prophetic Extracts* and the *Demonstration on the Gospel*, in Hollerich's estimation, 'share a concern to vindicate Christianity's superiority to Judaism by reading the Old Testament as a prophetic anticipation of Christ and the spread of the gospel to the Gentiles'.⁹ But it was not necessarily to the Jews alone that Eusebius envisioned his impact; we may also consider his engagement with Porphyry. Eusebius wrote a 25-book work, now lost, against this pagan philosopher. While the extent to which Eusebius engaged Porphyrian critiques in other works should be approached with caution, as he often does not cite the source of his anonymous pagan detractors, we can be confident that much of their encounter took place on exegetical grounds.¹⁰ Similarly, the *Extracts* is primarily an exegetical work, and the *Demonstration* is an arrangement of biblical texts so as to create a narrative of the presence of the Logos within salvation history.¹¹ In these works, Eusebius developed several typologies and theophanic episodes. To complicate the dimension of Eusebius's 'apologetic' work further, there was a theological

-
- 8 See D.A. Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea Against Paganism* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 57 n. 109 for the *Prophetic Extracts* and DelCogliano, 'Basil of Caesarea on Proverbs', 188–189 for the passage in *Ecclesiastical Theology*. While unclear, Kofsky must have in mind texts such as *Ecl. Proph.* 3.1 (GAISFORD, 98,1–2, 9–11, 13–15): 'It is fitting that the whole book of Proverbs is spoken from the person of wisdom ... Wisdom being the second cause of all things after the First God, the cause that was by the God-Word in the beginning towards God ... before all beings and extensions [Wisdom] was created' (πάσα μὲν ἡ βίβλος τῶν Παροιμιῶν ἐκ προσώπου λέγεσθαι τῆς Σοφίας ἔοικε ... ἡ [σοφία] οὐσα τῷ μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον Θεὸν δευτέρῳ τῶν ὄλων αἰτίῳ, τῷ τε ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν Θεῷ Λόγῳ ... πρὸ πάσης οὐσίας τε καὶ ὑποστάσεως ἔκτισται).
- 9 Hollerich, 'Eusebius as Polemical Interpreter', 587. The *Prophetic Extracts* was composed as books 6–9 of his *General Elementary Introduction*, of which only fragments from the first books survive. The text of the *Prophetic Extracts* edited by Gaisford has lacunae, discussed in G. Dorival, 'Remarques sur les *Eklogai prophétiques* d'Eusèbe de Césarée', in B. Janssens et al. (eds.), *Philomathestatos. Studies in Greek and Byzantine Texts Presented to Jacques Noret for his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, OLA 137 (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 203–224. For the role of prophetic exegesis in the *Demonstration*, see des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée*, 123–126.
- 10 See especially S. Morlet, 'Eusebius' Polemic Against Porphyry: A Reassessment', in Inowlocki–Zamagni (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius*, 119–150; Zamagni, 'Porphyre est-il la cible'.
- 11 J.R. Laurin, *Orientations maîtresses des apologistes chrétiens de 270 à 361*, *Analecta Gregoriana* 61 (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1954), 379.

dimension at stake. Bucur stresses that in their exegesis of the theophany of the Burning Bush (Ex 3,2), Eusebius and Marcellus disagreed sharply on the identity of the divine presence. The latter held that the divine presence may be explained as 'by the Father through the Word', whereas Eusebius emphatically held that in theophanies prior to the giving of the law of Moses, it was the Logos as a distinct hypostasis who appeared.¹²

Finally, some of Eusebius's contributions involved more scientific formats of biblical scholarship, often intended with no less a theological or apologetic scope. Developing many of these from preceding Origenian materials, Eusebius compiled in a successful and influential form the following scholarly tools: canon tables on the gospels and the Psalms; critical introductory discussions and organizational descriptions for interpreting the Psalms; literary questions and answers on the Gospels, most involving potential incoherencies and contradictions; the *Onomasticon*, providing knowledge about biblical topography, geography, and etymological interpretation; the *Chronicle*, an ambitious attempt to bring together biblical and Roman history in an accessible and apologetically compelling way.¹³ Next to these tools should be placed his full-length commentaries on the Psalms, Isaiah, and possibly on the gospel of Luke, much of which was based on the grammatical and philological tools at his disposal.¹⁴

12 Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned*, 88–89. Bucur recommends, however, that Eusebius did not have Marcellus specifically in mind in his exegesis of this text in the *Demonstration*; Marcellus, on the other hand, likely did have Eusebius or the Eusebian/Asterian group in mind. For the impact of the Marcellan controversy on Eusebius's theophanic exegesis, see Kofsky, *Eusebius*, 54–56, esp. n. 101.

13 For composition and reception of the Gospel canons, see Crawford, *The Eusebian Canon Tables*; for the Psalter prologue material, the texts mentioned above are edited and discussed in C. Bandt et al. (eds.), *Die Prologtexte zu den Psalmen von Origenes und Eusebius*, TU 183 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2018); the critical edition of the *Gospel Questions* is SC 523, with an excellent illustrative case-study by C. Zamagni, 'Eusebius' Exegesis between Alexandria and Antioch: Being a Scholar in Caesarea (a Test Case from *Questions to Stephanos* 1)', in Inowlocki–Zamagni (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius*, 151–176; the critical edition of the *Onomasticon* is GCS NF 24, with the study of J. Stenger, 'Palestine as a Palimpsest: Eusebius' Construction of Memorial Space in the *Onomasticon*', *Exemplaria Classica* (Huelva) 7 (2016), 85–105 situating this work in Eusebius's wider apologetic interests; the Armenian recension of the *Chronicle* is accessible in GCS 20, and Jerome's Latin translation and continuation in GCS 24.

14 Respectively available in PG 23, EW 9 and PG 24, 528–606. For studies of these works, see the already cited works of: Hollerich (above, n. 5) plus his *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah*, OECs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999) and A.P. Johnson, 'The Ends of Transfiguration: Eusebius' Commentary on Luke (PG 24,549)', in *Eusebius of Caesarea* (eds.), 189–205.

Within recent studies of these works, scholars have vacillated regarding how to categorize Eusebius of Caesarea, some holding that he is best understood 'between Antioch and Alexandria'. For on the one hand, there is no denying that he shared Antiochene exegetical concerns. We see this at the methodological level regarding the role of the Septuagint in biblical exegesis. While not envisaging a return to the Hebrew or Semitic versions as Eusebius of Emesa and Jerome would after him, the *recentiores* are essential to Eusebius's method.¹⁵ But precisely his use of these philological resources also sets him at odds with the group that shared a keen interest in them, namely the Antiochenes Eusebius of Emesa, Diodore, Theodoret, and in part Theodore. For instance, in his *Hypomnemata*, an introductory text to the Psalter, Eusebius of Caesarea often brings up the readings of Aquila and Symmachus where they will confirm his typological, prophetic, or allegorical interpretations.¹⁶

But the Caesarean's work testifies to a shared exegetical culture with Antiochenes. This can be seen from common approaches to explanations of natural phenomenon in the bible. Take, for instance, the case of the heavens and the firmament (Gen 1,6–8). Earlier we saw John Chrysostom explain this text with reference to Hebrew and Syrian language traditions witnessed by Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa.¹⁷ In fact, when explaining the heavens and the firmament, Eusebius of Caesarea also discusses the nature of the 'plural heavens' (πλείους οὐρανούς) within the Scriptures, and he cites proof-texts which are found in a similar discussion on plural idiom in John Chrysostom's *Homily 4 on Genesis*.¹⁸ Another shared element for explaining this text occurred, suggesting that the common ground just mentioned is not due to the widespread popularity of the many-heavens theme alone. LXX-Psalm 23 dealt with creation imagery, such as the heavens, the waters, and the earth. The Caesarean stated that the creator demonstrates his power by 'bearing the earth high above the

15 Ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 121; Guinot, 'La fortune', 219–224; Barthelemy, 'Eusèbe', 56. According to Barthelemy, Eusebius of Caesarea did not abandon his Origenian heritage on this point. For Eusebius of Caesarea, the Septuagint still had primacy, and the variant versions were used as exegetical tools for maximizing the possibilities of argumentation. It is not until Eusebius of Emesa that the step towards correction and revision of the Septuagint is made in reference to Semitic versions; Jerome takes this to its logical conclusion. See further Kamesar, *Jerome*.

16 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Hypomn.* 3.26–32 (TU 183.246); 13.5–15 (ibid., 260).

17 See Chapter 4.2.2.4.

18 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Comm. in Ps. ad 18,2* (PG 23.188d–189a). The use of LXX-Ps 148,4 and 115,16 in this passage is paralleled in John Chrysostom and other Antiochenes. In my earlier article, Pomeroy, 'Numbering the Heavens', I missed this important parallel.

backs of the waters' (ἄνω φέρεσθαι μετέωρον ὑπὲρ τὰ νῶτα τῶν ὑδάτων).¹⁹ Remarkably, Eusebius of Emesa,²⁰ Theodore,²¹ and John Chrysostom²² all use this exact metaphor of the 'backs of the waters' to explain the firmament, Chrysostom reproducing Eusebius of Caesarea's terminology. Thus, the Caesarean was either a mediating influence or an early witness to the format and some of the formulations within biblical commentary that would become precious to later Antiochene authors.

As already indicated, however, the difficulty in characterizing Eusebius of Caesarea comes when we find he used his literal exegetical observations to substantiate his understanding of the 'godly *politeia*',²³ which required allegorical reading. For instance, in the same passage from the *Commentary on the Psalms* where he describes the creation of the earth in terms of it riding on the 'backs of the waters', he shifts his tone. This cosmological picture afforded by Psalm 23 is consistent with the 'sense' (διάνοια) of Christ's kingdom. In another verse from Psalm 23, we encounter a trumpet blast. Read with 1 Thess 4.16, we may view from Psalm 23 the coming kingdom of Christ, itself announced by the trumpet.²⁴ This should cause us pause in evaluating the *Commentary on the Psalms* as belonging to Eusebius's 'literalism' phase in distinction from his 'Origenist'

19 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Comm. Ps. ad 23.1* (PG 23.220d).

20 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 6b (TEG 15.34): 'Some philosophers' (οἱ μὲν ... φιλοσοφῶντες) raise a question at this point. Correcting their understanding, the Emesene explains the phenomenon of the firmament. Three distinct aspects are noted, as in Chrysostom: the carrying of the 'water above' (ἡ ὑπερ) the firmament; the explanation that this means it is 'on the backs' (ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀπίσθεν) of the firmament; and there is another portion of water below (ὑποκάτω) this firmament.

21 Theodore, *Frag. Gen.* 1 (SACHAU, 4.1–3): the waters above the firmament are carried 'on its back' (على ظهره). This metaphor is not in Theodoret, *Q. Gen.* 11 (LEC 1.28–30), but finds some further use in later Syriac authors, see T. Jansma, 'Investigations in the Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis. An Approach to the Exegesis of the Nestorian Church and the to the Comparison of Nestorian and Jewish Exegesis', *OtSt* 12 (1958), 115.

22 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 4.3 (PG 53.41–42): 'to bear ... above the backs ... high above the ground' (φέρεισθαι ... ὑπὲρ τῶν νώτων ... ἄνω μετέωρα). This was likely mediated through Eusebius of Emesa, as Chrysostom's application aligns more with him than the Caesarean. The subject for Eusebius of Caesarea is the earth, not the division of the waters at creation. Our present point is that the Caesarean shared terminology around similar biblical exegetical ideas.

23 Hollerich, 'Eusebius' *Commentary on the Psalms*, 157–159; cf. *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah*, esp. 125–126.

24 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Comm. Ps. ad 23.4–8* (PG 23.224a): 'For this here gives out the Holy Spirit and the shout and voice of the trumpet. For [it is] in the ascension of the Son of God into the heavens' (ἐνταῦθα γὰρ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ τὸν ἀλαλαγμὸν καὶ τὴν φωνὴν τῆς σάλπιγγος ἀποδίδωσιν. 'Εν γὰρ τῇ εἰς οὐρανούς ἀναβάσει τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ).

phase.²⁵ Yet, like Chrysostom's hermeneutical 'rule' mentioned in the *Isaiah* 6 work, Eusebius establishes a salvation-history typology by imagery based in particular biblical words, here the trumpet. Even in his critical study, to demonstrate the veracity and providential ordering of the biblical witnesses, he used the linguistic tools at his disposal to argue for typological connections, occasional psychological allegory, and contemporary prophetic fulfillment of texts in his imperial context.

Aspects of these departures from literal exegesis recur in John Chrysostom. In what follows, I assess Eusebius of Caesarea's influence on typology and theophanic explanations in the *Homilies on Genesis*.

1 Typology

Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore were wary of typological exegesis. From the surviving material of their commentaries on Genesis, they seem to agree on the use of rather obvious and conservative typologies, such as the ram suspended in the bush during the Aqedah (Gen 22) as a signification of the cross.²⁶ Chrysostom appears to have been slightly more liberal in this regard, stretching beyond the limits set by his Antiochene predecessors by applying 'a hermeneutical key by which texts are invested with mimetic and representational meaning'.²⁷ In doing so he uses terminology and ideas likely originated by Eusebius of Caesarea. We consider two cases, that of Phares and Zara, and that of the blessing of Jacob.

1.1 *Phares and Zara*

In Mt 1,2–3, the wily Old Testament character Tamar, who posed as a prostitute to ensure the continuation of her lineage, is memorialized in the genealogy of Jesus.²⁸ This inspired early Christian authors to investigate what her significance might be. A difficulty emerged in the Genesis text where the birth of her

25 So Curti, 'L'esegesi'; and more recently S. Morlet, 'Origen as Exegetical Source', in Johnson-Schott (eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea*, 207–237.

26 Ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 99–100; for detailed analysis of the example of typology in Gen 22, pp. 323–331; cf. further discussion of Eusebius of Emesa's exegetical method in Van Rompay, *Eusèbe d'Emèse*, TEG 15.XXXIII–XXXIV.

27 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 193.

28 There was already messianic speculation on this text in *Bereshit Rabbah* 85.14 (THEODOR-ALBECK, 11:1049) and *The Testament of Judah*; see discussion in E.M. Menn, *Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38) in Ancient Jewish Exegesis. Studies in Literary Form and Hermeneutics*, SJSJ 51 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 160–163.

twin sons is recounted. At the moment of delivery, one son, Zara, first breaches the birth canal by sticking out his hand, which suggests that he is the firstborn. He withdraws his hand, however. Phares, the other son, then comes forward and is actually born first. Having delivered the children, the midwife asks, 'Why has an obstruction been broken because of you?' (Gen 38,23–28) But to whom was this question addressed, the child who made the original breach (Zara) or the actually-first-born child for whom the breach was made (Phares)?

Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore address the question as such. They say that the midwife addresses Zara, the second-born who initially stretched his hand out of the birth canal. Diodore says that this can be explained by the working of, on the one hand, 'nature' (ἡ μὲν φύσις), and, on the other hand, 'God' (ὁ δὲ θεός).²⁹ The latter gave to Phares, who seemed to be second-born, the privilege of the first-born. From Phares, then, the royal race and eventually Christ according to the flesh descended.³⁰ John Chrysostom knows this discussion, as twice in his *œuvre* he recognizes that what is happening here is 'not according to the sequence of nature' (οὐδὲ γὰρ κατὰ φύσεως ἀκολουθεῖαν).³¹ His reasoning for this, however, is quite different than that of Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa.

In his *Homily 62 on Genesis* and *Homily 3 on Matthew*, there are five notable aspects of Chrysostom's handling of the Zara and Phares episode. First, the use of onomastic interpretation. Chrysostom knows that Phares means 'breach' (διακοπήν) or 'division' (μερισμός). He also knows 'Zara, which is interpreted "rising" [ἐρμηνεύεται ἀνατολή]'.³² Based on this interpretation, Chrysostom thereby understands the midwife's question to have addressed Phares, for he is the 'barrier' here. This is in distinct contrast to Diodore and Eusebius, for whom the midwife's question addresses Zara. Second, the mention of typology. These twins are a 'type [τύπος] of things to come', 'predicted [προαναφώνησιν] as a mystery'³³ and containing 'hints' (αἰνίγματα).³⁴ Third, the content of the typol-

29 Diodore, *Coisl.* 267,27–28 (CCSG 15,249). See full presentation and discussion of fragments in ter Haar Romeny, *Syrian*, 400–406.

30 Diodore, *Coisl.* 267,29–30 (CCSG 15,249): 'From whom David and the royal race, even Christ "according to the flesh"' (ἐξ οὗ ὁ Δαυὶδ καὶ τὸ βασιλικὸν γένος, καὶ το κατὰ σάρκα [Rom 1,3] ὁ κύριος).

31 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 62.2 (PG 53,535); the exact same expression occurs in *In Matt. hom.* 3 (HM 1,31b): οὐδὲ γὰρ φυσικῆς ἀκολουθίας ἦν.

32 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 62.2 (PG 54,535).

33 *Ibid.*, PG 54,534.

34 John Chrysostom, *In Matt. hom.* 3 (HM 1,31a, c). For further discussion of Chrysostom's application of 'type' in exegetical contexts, see Pizzolato, 'L'antitipo', 186–187, who understands Chrysostom as employing 'coupled' typology. Guinot, 'L'exégèse figurative', 14, suggests that Chrysostom's typology may be understood according to a scheme of a prophecy 'in deeds'. By this Guinot means that Chrysostom viewed typology when he could recog-

ogy. As Chrysostom expresses it in *Homily 62 on Genesis*, Phares denotes 'the Jewish way of life' (ἡ Ἰουδαϊκὴ πολιτεία). For him this means 'the keeping [παρὰ-τήρησις] of the law'. It is this way of life which encroaches upon that of the patriarchs who lived prior to the giving of the Mosaic law. Noah, Abraham, Abel, and Enoch were 'of satisfaction [εὐαρεστήσεως] to God' and lived according to 'the spiritual and virtuous way [πολιτείαν]'. Zara, he explains further in the context of *Homily 62 on Genesis*, is thereby 'the type of the church' (ὁ τύπος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας).³⁵ In the *Homily 3 on Matthew*, this Church is described as the 'new people' (τοῦ νέου λαοῦ).³⁶ Fourth, he explains the original appearance of this way of life with the distinct expression of 'moved gradually [μικρὸν] forward'.³⁷ Historically speaking, for Chrysostom, the spiritual way briefly stretched itself out, as Zara did from the birth canal. However, the era of the Mosaic law took over for a time, as Phares surpassed Zara in order of birth. Finally, Chrysostom supports his discussion by reference to some biblical texts. *Homily 62 on Genesis* concludes by mentioning Mt 1,2–3, having sufficiently indicated why the twins and their mother are included in the genealogy of the Lord. Inspired by the same discussion in his *Homily 3 on Matthew*, Chrysostom cites Eph 2,14, Isa 5,2, and LXX-Ps 79,13 as cases where the word 'barrier' (φραγμόν) is used to signify the law, which encroached for a time on the spiritual polity but eventually receded now that the Gentiles have entered the Church.

Chrysostom himself indicates that he used a source to elaborate this typology. In his *Homily 3 on Matthew*, he claims that 'some who have examined these things closely say' (φασί τινες τῶν ταῦτα ἀκριβῶς ἐξητακόντων) that the twins represent a type of the two peoples. Further, he claims that 'others' (ἄλλοι δὲ) reckon that the barrier represented by Phares is the Jewish law.³⁸ While it was shown that he knows the distinction over natural and divine processes mentioned in Diodore, Chrysostom's 'some people' (τινες) are likely in reality a single person, namely Eusebius of Caesarea. This Eusebius possesses all five elements from Chrysostom seen above, and much of it occurs in similar formulations.

First, Eusebius of Caesarea is the first known author to give the interpretation of Zara as 'rising', and he presents this in the same formulation as in

nize in a narrative of the Old Testament a figure which is 'doubled' in the New Testament. Cf. Guillet, 'Les exégèses', 274 and Förster, *Chrysostomus*, 29–32, who suggest an instructive comparison of Chrysostom's typological theories with Theodore of Mopsuestia.

35 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 62.2 (PG 53.535).

36 John Chrysostom, *In Matt. hom.* 3 (HM 1.32b).

37 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 62.2 (PG 53.535).

38 John Chrysostom, *In Matt. hom.* 3 (HM 1.31c, 32a).

Chrysostom's *Homily 62 on Genesis* (ἐρμηνεύεται ἀνατολή).³⁹ Eusebius thereby understands the midwife's question as addressed to Phares, who is interpreted as 'boundary' (μερισμός), for he shows 'the breach of the barrier' (τῆς τοῦ φραγμοῦ διακοπῆς),⁴⁰ the same onomastic interpretation presented in Chrysostom. Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa do not use this terminology, nor do they propose onomastic interpretation at all. Second, the Caesarean presents a typological interpretation in similar terms to that given by Chrysostom. For Eusebius, in the characters of Zara and Phares we are dealing with 'it hints at' (αἰνίττεται) or a story that 'predicts' (προεβάλετο) the outline of future realities.⁴¹ The content of this hint brings us to our third point of similarity. Eusebius of Caesarea claims that Phares and Zara hint at 'two ways of life' (δύο βίων), that according to the gospel and that according to the law of Moses. He presents the same historical structure as found in Chrysostom. The way of life represented by Zara actually exited first, signified by the hand breaching the womb. By this Eusebius of Caesarea means the patriarchs, pious men who led the 'life [βίος] of those loving God'. In this 'they showed forth the active [πρακτικὸν] life', which, despite living long ago, was that 'according to the gospel polity [πολιτείαν]'.⁴² This way of life was eventually revived in 'us from the nations' (ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν), solidifying the notion that Zara is a type of both the Church and the Patriarchs. These elements are directly paralleled in John Chrysostom's discussion of the polity of the Church and the 'well-pleasing' and virtuous men living prior to the law. Fourth, Eusebius also witnesses the description of this way of life 'rising briefly [μικρά]' before ceding place to the law,⁴³ the same subtle description which Chrysostom uses. Finally, the Caesarean referenced biblical texts to support his understanding of the 'barrier' or 'division' denoted by Phares as the law of Moses. He cites Isa 58,12 and Eph 2,14, both paralleled in Chrysostom.⁴⁴ Given the five similarities, and the rarity of this typology before Eusebius of Caesarea,⁴⁵ he should be viewed as the source of Chrysostom's typology. The

39 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Q. Steph.* 7.5.110–111 (SC 523.138). On this page, Zamagni notes that there are no traces of this onomastic interpretation prior to Eusebius of Caesarea.

40 Ibid., 7.4.90 (SC 523.136).

41 Ibid., 7.4.91–92, 154 (SC 523.136, 140).

42 Ibid., 7.4.100, 116, 153–154 (SC 523.136–140). For exploration of this theme in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Preparation on the Gospel* and *Demonstration on the Gospel*, see respectively A.P. Johnson, *Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius' Praeparatio Evangelica*, OPCS (Oxford, 2006); and des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée*, 130–136.

43 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Q. Steph.* 7.7.163 (SC 523.140).

44 Ibid., 7.6.146–147 (SC 523.140).

45 A fragment attributed to Origen, *Cat.* 1838 (TEG 4.202), contains three elements mentioned here: 'type of the Church' (τύπον τῆς ἐκκλησίας), 'bears a type of the gospel way of

preacher appears to adopt the Caesarean's take on this passage with precision. It is another case in which Chrysostom works with multiple sources, and he discerns that Diodore and the Emesene neglected the full treasure of meaning available in this episode.

1.2 *The Blessing of Jacob*

Chrysostom was also interested in developing messianic typology. One such case occurs around the Blessing of Jacob, the text towards the end of the book of Genesis which foretells of the fate of Jacob's descendants and the kingly destiny of some of his tribes (Gen 49, discussed above in Chapter 4.2.3.2).⁴⁶ In Gen 49,8, it is mentioned that Judah's brothers will praise him, and various details from

life' (εὐαγγελικοῦ βίου φέρει τύπον); Phares viewed 'according to [the era of] Moses' (κατὰ Μωσέα) and Zara viewed as 'according to the Christ [way] of life' (κατὰ Χριστὸν βίου). The catenist places this after Chrysostom's interpretation from the *Homily 3 on Matthew*, see *Cat.* 1834 (TEG 4.199–201). However, Metzler does not include *Cat.* 1838 in her collection of Origen's fragments, as it is only found in Type III of the catena, witnessed only by mss Leningrad, Public Library, Gr. 124. This mss is known to add fragments from earlier authors. Petit, *La chaîne*, TEG 4.XIII–IV suggests that anonymous or feeble attributions in the *catena* may be tentatively identified or given strength of possible identification by discovering parallels to the fragment in question throughout the work of the attributed author. In this case, mentions of Tamar and her sons elsewhere in Origen's work do not provide parallels to this typology; there is thus no evidence that this typology originated with Origen. On the contrary, for the red thread tied to Zara's hand when it exited the womb, Origen regularly viewed the Tamar episode as a type of the cross. He does not envision the ethnic values ascribed by Eusebius of Caesarea and John Chrysostom: e.g., Origen, *Comm. serm. Mt.* 125 (GCS 38.261,17–18): 'What is done here is in one of Tamar's sons being born stretching out the hand ... in sign of the passion [*in signo futurae passionis Christi*]; *Frag. in Lev. apud Mon. Gr.* 358 (GCS 29.410,24–27): 'The color "scarlet" is a symbol [σύμβολον] of the royal blood ... in the birth of Phares'. Many of the elements discussed here, though lacking onomastic interpretation of Phares, are found in Ambrose, *Exp. Ev. Luc.* 3.20–21 (CCSL 14.84–91), who calls the twins' birth a 'mysterious riddle' (*aenigmata mysterium*) which describes the 'lives of two peoples' (*uita populorum*), one 'according to the law / letter' (*secundum legem / litteram*) the other 'according to faith / grace' (*secundum fidem / gratiam*), the latter typifying the 'bond of absolute freedom' (*vinculis absoluti libera*) based in 'Zara whose name is interpreted "Rising"' (*Zara, qui interpretatione significatur oriens*). Jerome, *Comm. in Proph. Mich. ad* 2,11–13 (CCSL 76.455–456) reverses the position of Eusebius and Chrysostom. While applying the twins to the Church and the Jews, Jerome sees the Church from the Gentiles prefigured by Phares.

46 For discussion of the Septuagint reception of this tradition, see J. Lust, *Messianism and the Septuagint. Collected Essays*, BETL 178 (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 180–181; the Dead Sea Scrolls' presentation of the messiah with kingly and priestly functions via this text is discussed in J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star. The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature*, Anchor Bible Reference (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 75–77; 202.

TABLE 7 Chrysostom, Eusebius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Emesa, Diodore on Gen 49,8–11

Genesis	Chrysostom	Eusebius of Caesarea	Eusebius of Emesa	Diodore
49,8 Of a lion λέοντος ^a	Kingly βασιλικήν	Kingly βασιλικής	Tribe γενεῆς	– Of a tribe φυλῆς – Strong ἰσχυρόν
49,9 He rises ἐγερεῖ ^b	Grave, resurrec- tion ταφὴν, ἀνάστασιν	Of resurrection ἀναστάσεως	Heritage κληρονομία	Inheritance κληρονομίαν
49,11 Vine ἄμπελον ^c	His own teaching τὴν οἰκείαν διδασκα- λίαν	The teaching of the word of God ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου διδασκαλία	Power ἐξουσία	Israel Ἰσραήλ
49,12 White λευκοί ^d	– The righteous one τὸ δίκαιον – The radiance of his judgment τὸ λαμπρὸν τοῦ κριτοῦ	– New covenant καινῆς διαθήκης – The radiance τὸ λαμπρὸν – The purity of the mysterious food τὸ καθαρόν τῆς μυστηριώδους τρο- φῆς – Judging with truth σὺν ἀληθείᾳ κρίνων	– Just government κατὰ δίκην – Gentleness ἡμερότητα – Purity καθαρότητα	– Speaking λόγων – The purity of his teaching τὸ καθαρόν αὐτοῦ τῆς διδασκαλίας

a PG 54:574; § 63, GCS 23.364,5–9; TEG 15.172; 299,7, 9 (CCSG 15.273–274).

b PG 54:574; § 66, GCS 23.364,13; TEG 15.172; 299,12 (CCSG 15.274).

c PG 54:574; § 72, GCS 23.365,21; TEG 15.174; 300,8 (CCSG 15.276).

d PG 54:574; § 78, GCS 23.366,21; cf. the same expression in Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecl. Proph.* 4.9 (GAISFORD, 188,16): σὺν ἀληθείᾳ κρίνων; TEG 15.174; 302,17 (CCSG 15.279).

the other tribes explain how this will occur. In the table above I present aspects of John Chrysostom's handling of this biblical text in comparison to Eusebius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Emesa, and Diodore. We are fortunate to possess lengthy extracts of Diodore's commentary on this passage in the *Collectio Coisliniana*. Combined with the *Armenian Commentary on Genesis* of Eusebius of Emesa, we are able to compare how these four authors handled the famous messianic text. In Table 7 above, I present condensed forms of their comments on particu-

lar words and expressions from Gen 49. To highlight Chrysostom's dependence on Eusebius of Caesarea's ideas over against those of his Antiochene predecessors, I place in bold the formulations common to Eusebius of Caesarea and John Chrysostom. Footnotes in column 1 reference the primary sources in the corresponding rows, with abbreviated references to John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 67.2 (PG 53), Eusebius of Caesarea, *Dem. Ev.* 8.1 (GCS 23), Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 143–150 (TEG 15), and Diodore, *Coisl.* 299, 300, 302 (CCSG 15).

From Table 7 above, we see that there was considerably detailed disagreement between Chrysostom and Eusebius of Caesarea on the one hand and Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa on the other. The fundamental issue appears to concern *where*, exactly—not *if*—the lengthy prophetic passage in Gen 49 may be applied to Christ. For Chrysostom and Eusebius of Caesarea, it is from the very beginning and extends through the whole. Coming to Gen 49,8 in his *Homily 67 on Genesis*, Chrysostom views the 'whole at once' (πάντα ἀπαξαπλῶς) as a reference to the mystery of Christ's passion.⁴⁷ He proceeds by providing more detailed correspondences, such as the 'white teeth' (49,12) and Christ's justice. In presenting a birds-eye view of the text, a non-literal *skopos* for the whole pericope, Chrysostom disagrees with Diodore, for whom the blessing of Judah is 'not concerning the Lord' (οὐ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου) and affirms rather that it is really about the governance of the 'tribes' (φυλῆς).⁴⁸ One recalls here Chrysostom's disagreement with Theodore about whether the pericope of Zorobabel could be wholly 'about' Christ, Chrysostom affirming and Theodore denying (see above, Chapter 4.3.2). Thus, Chrysostom can proceed and find a reference to Christ's 'kingly' attribute in the 'lion' of 49,8;⁴⁹ the word 'he rises' from 49,9 can, like in Eusebius of Caesarea,⁵⁰ inspire Chrysostom to see a hint of the resurrection. Both references directly oppose the views of Eusebius of

47 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 67.2 (PG 54.574).

48 Diodore *Coisl.* 299,7 (CCSG 15.273); Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 143 (TEG 15.172). One term from Gen 49 that Diodore takes as messianic is προσδοκία τῶν ἐθνῶν (49,10). But he arrives here only because Christ descends from the tribe of Judah according to the flesh (CCSG 15.274,26–27). See further below, n. 55.

49 The bestiary explanation in John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 67.2 (PG 54.574), which Chrysostom explains is a habit (ἔθος) of reference (αἰνίττεσθαι), is found in similar terms, with greater expansion, in Theodore, *Interp. in Ezech. ad 1,10* (PG 81.825) where the animal names 'reference' (αἰνίττεται) the following: 'lion' (λέων) = royalty (βασιλείαν); 'bull' (μόσχος) = 'priesthood' (ἱερωσύνην); 'eagle' (ἀετός) = 'prophecy' (προφητείαν).

50 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Dem. Ev.* 8.1.66 (GCS 23.364,13). He may develop this from Origen, *Cat.* 2164 (TEG 4.380): 'That 'he has laid himself down' signifies the death of Christ according to the economy' (τὸν κατ' οἰκονομίαν θάνατον τοῦ Χριστοῦ σημαίνει τὸ κατακλιθεῖς).

Emesa and Diodore, for whom Gen 49,8–9 envisages Judah's tribes and their inheritance. By verse 12, however, both Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore accept some references to Christ.⁵¹

Chrysostom's reliance on ideas found in Eusebius of Caesarea becomes clearer from the vantage point of verse 11. In this text, the ruler of Judah 'will attach his colt to the vine'. Early Christian apologists took this as prefiguring an episode in the life of Christ (Mt 21,2–11) where Christ seeks out a 'colt' in Jerusalem.⁵² Eusebius of Caesarea read the text this way. But he also identified a further Christological reference. In John 15,1, Christ says that 'I am the true vine', referring to his teaching of the disciples. Eusebius of Caesarea cites this Johannine text and explains that the same word 'vine' from the Genesis text of the Blessing of Jacob is a reference to 'the teaching of the Word of God' (ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου διδασκαλία). It is this aspect which Chrysostom picks up. The 'vine' in Gen 49,11, he says, refers to Christ's 'own teaching' (τὴν οἰκείαν διδασκαλίαν). Like the Caesarean, he cites John 15,1 to prove this. Diodore seems to have known and explicitly rejected this opinion. He states that 'some say' (τινὲς φασιν) that this 'vine' in the Blessing of Jacob connects to the episode in the life of Christ where he commands his disciples to search out a colt to ride in Jerusalem. These people miss the sequence (ἀκολουθίαν) of the text. 'We do not rely on these opinions,' he says, 'insofar as we most prefer the historical aspect to the allegorical'.⁵³ For Diodore, the 'colt' in the blessing of Jacob pericope refers to Israel, not to the Lord, his life, or his teaching. It appears, then, that Diodore knew Eusebius of Caesarea's opinion and rejected it; the Caesarean again is the figure behind an Antiochene 'some say'. It is interesting, though, that Diodore proceeded in face of verse 12 to admit that the 'whiteness' of the messianic ruler's teeth refers to the purity of his teaching. For this is the exact terminology we find used by Eusebius of Caesarea. Antiochene exegetes thereby shared a close framework of options for explaining the prophetic references of this important biblical text, and the views of Eusebius of Caesarea figured among their resources.

The detailed analysis of Gen 49 in fourth-century exegetes shows a high-stakes disagreement among Christian sources. Earlier it was mentioned that

51 From what we can tell of the surviving material, for Diodore only two aspects of the whole prophecy apply to Christ. They are found in *Coisl.* 302,9–11; 19–21 (CCSG 15,279): the 'blood of the grapes' (49,11), about which he admits that the mystery of the blood of the savior is a pious reading; the 'teeth' (49,12), which he seems to take as a reference Christ's teaching.

52 Harl, *La Genèse*, 309.

53 Diodore, *Coisl.* 300,2; 24–27 (CCSG 15,276): ταῦτα ἡμεῖς οὐ δι᾽σχυρίζομεθα ... ὅτι τοῦ ἀλληγορικοῦ τὸ ἱστορικὸν πλείστον ὅσον προτιμῶμεν.

Julian had ridiculed this text and denied its prophetic import (above, Chapter 1.3), and to this point we may recall Thome's *Historia contra mythos* thesis regarding Antiochene anti-allegorical exegesis, namely that it was aimed at Julian who had tried to foster civic religion through allegorical interpretation of myths. It can be safely assumed that where Diodore and Theodore expressed anti-allegorical polemics, they believed that the envisaged non-literal reading introduced a 'sense beyond what was written' and often opened the door to dangerous theological speculation regarding Trinitarian subordinationism and problematic conceptions of post-eschatological phenomena.⁵⁴ But their exact targets of such polemics are not always the same, and the question of exegetical debates over text-referents must not be discounted as a determining factor. The scholastic culture of patristic exegesis here studied shows a remarkably precise debate. Our analysis shows that at least some Antiochene anti-allegorical stances were aimed at Eusebius of Caesarea's biblical exegesis, exegesis that in this specific instance does not envision subordinationist tendencies and so may be taken as an important case distinguishing Antiochene exegesis as concerned with what Diodore calls the 'history'. This example stands out, further, because it sets Chrysostom apart from his Antiochene predecessors, (willingly?) becoming the target of an exegetical polemic. The fundamental difference between Chrysostom and his fellow Antiochenes from this case is the choice to view an entire pericope as 'about' one Christological subject. Why Chrysostom chose this particular pericope to take such a stance is unclear, but the fact that he had multiple resources at his disposal for expounding Gen 49 may have presented him an opportunity to create a more coherent exposition of the final chapters of Genesis for his mass-audience.

2 Theophanies

Eusebius of Caesarea advanced the exegesis of Old Testament theophanic episodes in the context of complex apologetic and theological debates, with the overall goal of substantiating the presence of the Logos in human history prior to the giving of the law of Moses through testimonial presentation.⁵⁵ As

54 Theodore, *Tr. c. all.* 3 (CSCO 189.8, 20–21). I borrow this emphasis from Ondrey, *The Minor Prophets*, 26–27.

55 Morlet, *La Démonstration*, 440–441 and Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned*, 34; 82 ascribe to Eusebius's exegesis of theophanies an apologetic dimension, and I follow the latter's emphasis on the testimonial shape of these strategies. For the impact of theophanic exegesis in later fourth-century authors contemporary to Chrysostom, see Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Theoph.*, GNO 3/1.120–121; cf. Cassin, 'De Deitate', 299–301, where Gregory's handling of

seen in his typology of Zara and Phares, his goal was to show that Judaism was an abrogation of the original virtuous state of humanity embodied by patriarchs like Abraham. Part of this virtuous state was, as he puts it in his *Prophetic Extracts*, ‘association’ (ὁμιλία) with the Logos himself.⁵⁶ Several passages from Eusebius’s *œuvre* are devoted explicitly to demonstrating this from an assembly of Old Testament texts and commentary on their ‘mystical’ (μυστικός) or ‘contemplative’ (θεωρία) sense, such as chapter 1 of the *Prophetic Extracts* or chapter 5 of the *Demonstration on the Gospel*.⁵⁷ From these texts he developed formulations for expressing how the divine Logos appeared to characters in the Old Testament.⁵⁸ In what follows I demonstrate that discussions in these works, the *Extracts* and the *Demonstration*, influenced aspects of John Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Genesis*. There are three dimensions to consider: biblical framework, formulations regarding the divine nature, and formulations regarding the pre-Incarnate human forms taken by the divine.

2.1 *Biblical Citation Framework*

Antiochenes were concerned with establishing the historical beginnings of theophanic appearances according to the bible. Eusebius of Emesa witnesses a debate about how to identify the first biblical theophany, and Chrysostom follows him. Sticking close to the biblical text, they hold that the first theophany occurs the first time the bible uses the word ‘he appeared’.⁵⁹ They found this word in Gen 12,7, when God tells Abram of his promises towards him and his descendants. The discussion of Eusebius of Emesa and Chrysostom may be contextualized further by reference to Eusebius of Caesarea. In his *Prophetic Extracts*, the Caesarean gives a slightly different take on same question. According to him, Gen 12,7 is actually the ‘second’ (δεύτερος) theophany; prior to this, God called Abraham out of his homeland (Gen 12,1). Although the text makes no mention of divine appearance, this implies a theophany, making it the ‘first’ (πρώτος).⁶⁰ Eusebius thereby informs the background to the Antiochene discussion about how to study and enumerate the biblical theophanies.

the binding of Isaac narrative (Gen 22,1–14), is a theophany of the Father and Son. Cassin shows that Gregory singles out this passage as a tough case to tackle for the exposition of his Trinitarian theology.

56 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecl. Proph.* 1.3 (GAISFORD, 10,11, 20).

57 Des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée*, 124.

58 Kofsky, *Eusebius*, 50–57.

59 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 60b (TEG 15,110): ‘first’ (ἄνωτον); John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 32.2 (PG 53,294): ‘We first find this word now in the Scriptures’ (πρώτον τοῦτο εὕρισκομεν ἐν τῇ Γραφῇ νῦν τὸ ῥηθέν) see further discussion in Chapter 5.

60 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecl. Proph.* 1.3 (GAISFORD, 6,18–26).

Another case indicates that Chrysostom and Eusebius of Caesarea shared a biblical framework for understanding the theophanic episodes. These two authors shared interest in discussing the theophanic episodes for potential contradictions raised. Early Christian authors were aware that the Old Testament offered a considerable dossier of texts regarding whether the divine had appeared in some visible form to human beings. Some biblical texts, like the use of 'He appeared' in Gen 12,7, suggested that the divine nature had been seen by human eyes; others seemed to indicate clearly that the divine remained invisible. Chrysostom raises such a potential contradiction in his *Homily 32 on Genesis*. The passages he has in mind are Ex 33,20 and several cases from the prophets where the Lord was seen. He lists prophetic names without quoting in full: Daniel, Isaiah, Ezekiel. One text that does receive full quotation, acting as a cipher for the other prophetic experiences, is LXX-Os 12,11: 'I multiplied visions and by the hands of the prophets I was made an object of comparison'. In the other cases listed, therefore, '[the prophet] saw him' (αὐτὸν εἶδεν).⁶¹ Yet these visions were distinct from the Incarnation, which is God appearing without prophetic vision.⁶² This makes sense of the Exodus text, which seems to suggest that seeing God is impossible. For Chrysostom, the prophets did not see God in the sense that we see him in the Incarnation. A similar framework of qualitative evaluation of biblical texts about theophanies is given in the first chapter of Eusebius of Caesarea's *Prophetic Extracts*. 'Let us inquire' (ἐπαπορήσομεν), says Eusebius, 'how the Lord is immutable [ἀναλλοίωτος]'.⁶³ This is a problem because it seems suggested in Ex 33,20 that God is not seen by Moses, yet Isaiah 6,1 reports clearly that '[he] saw the Lord' (εἶδεν τὸν κύριον). Malachi and Jeremiah are cited to similar effect. Thus, Eusebius explains that some patriarchs and prophets saw the Logos. As in the Incarnation, here the invisible Logos became visible. But Moses did not have this vision; there is a 'distinction between their visions' (διαφόρως ὁφθέντα).⁶⁴ This move is part of Eusebius's wider apologetic enterprise of denying the Jews a privileged revelation in salvation history, viewing their part as a qualitative grade lower than that shared by the patriarchs prior to the law. Chrysostom does not take this peculiar view here, but we have seen that he appropriated it at points. Presently, this examination shows that Eusebius of Caesarea and Chrysostom treat the biblical theophanies under a similar framework of comparison from the vantage point of Ex 33,20, the prophets, and Abraham.

61 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 32.2 (PG 53.294).

62 See further analysis in Chapter 3.4.3.

63 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecl. Proph.* 1.3 (GAISFORD, 11,25).

64 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecl. Proph.* 1.3 (GAISFORD, 11,11).

Both authors establish their own distinctions among prophetic, patriarchal, and Incarnational appearances.⁶⁵ It is notable that in this respect, Eusebius of Emesa does not in his Genesis commentary offer comparative study of the visions of God.

2.2 *Divine Nature*

There is further indication on philological grounds that Eusebius of Caesarea influenced Chrysostom's understanding of Old Testament theophanies. They use similar formulations to express the divine nature allegedly seen. For Chrysostom, Abraham did not see God as such, 'his very being' (αὐτὴν τὴν οὐσίαν).⁶⁶ Rather, Abraham and the prophets saw him insofar as he was made 'worthy' (ἄξιως) given the 'capacity of human nature' (δυνατὸν τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ φύσει). Eusebius of Caesarea uses the same terminology to express a different take on the matter. According to him, the Logos 'turned up' (περιτρέπων) for 'certain tiny morsels' (μικροῖς τισὶ μορίοις) which are 'his very nature' (τὴν αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ οὐσίαν) first to Abraham and then to other prophets.⁶⁷ Elsewhere Eusebius explains that Jacob saw God insofar as the human mind was capable,⁶⁸ echoing Chrysostom's notion of vision according to the capacity of human nature. Bucur has illustrated that such formulations regarding the 'very being' of God is indicative of an anti-Marcellan context. Some theophanic exegetical traditions had reduced the Son to the word spoken in the burning bush (Ex 3), using the episode to deny that he was born out of the Father's essence.⁶⁹ Related to this environment, Chrysostom could discuss the theophanies of Genesis in relation to the divine essence with terminology shared by Eusebius. As with the shared biblical framework, this case does not suggest that Eusebius

65 Of course, there are numerous parallels among patristic authors, showing similar frameworks. See Le Boulluec-Sandevioir, *L'Exode*, 335; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 27.9.4 (SC 250.92), cites Elijah, Moses (Μωσῆά θεοφανείας ἡξιωμένος), and Paul; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech. hom.* 14.27 (PG 33.861a) cites Isa 6 and Ex 33.20 to suggest that the prophet saw the Son, like Eusebius of Caesarea. See a full presentation of the theophanic exegesis of Ex 33.20 in Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned*, 122–130. We note also that Origen had used a midrashic tradition to distinguish between a *vision* and *visions* of God, the latter supported by Ezk 1.1 and LXX-OS 12.11. This is explored in D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, TSAJ 16 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 214–215, where the midrashic tradition distinguishes these prophetic 'visions' from their actual experience of God's presence.

66 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 32.2 (PG 53.294).

67 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecl. Proph.* 1.3 (GAISFORD, 12,2–5).

68 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praep. Ev.* 11.6.31 (GCS 43/2.18,12–13): 'Insofar as might the knowledgeable and contemplative capacities in the human mind ...' (ὁποῖος ἂν εἴη ὁ γνωστικὸς καὶ θεωρητικὸς ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ νοῦς ...).

69 Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned*, 90.

was Chrysostom's source, but that they shared specific ideas and formulations for discussing the same theological issues arising from Genesis texts.

2.3 *Human Form*

Finally, there is the matter of pre-Incarnation appearances of God in human form, invoking what Bucur has identified as a distinction between the visual and the auditory components of theophanic exegesis.⁷⁰ Chrysostom speculates that the wrestler of Jacob (Gen 32,21–24) was actually the divine 'in human form' (ἐν σχήματι ἀνθρώπου).⁷¹ He does not specify that this is the Logos appearing in flesh. But the discussion of shape and form in this context derives from a prominent convergent point between theological and exegetical traditions, namely Athanasius's defense of the *homoousion*. For by reading in Gen 32,3 that 'the form of God' passed by Jacob, Athanasius took this as indelible proof of the oneness of the Son with the Father.⁷² Perhaps because its ambiguity saved him from entering complex and problematic discussions, this formulation sufficed for our preacher; it recurs throughout his *œuvre*, in the *Homilies on Genesis* and elsewhere to explain Genesis theophanies.⁷³ As we have seen, Eusebius of Caesarea was slightly more daring, arguing that Old Testament theophanies are Incarnations of the Logos. But he uses the same terminology as found in Chrysostom to express this. In chapter 5 of his *Demonstration* and the *Commentary on the Psalms*, he affirms that Jacob's divine contender in Gen 32 was the Logos 'in human form' (ἐν ἀνθρώπου σχήματι).⁷⁴ It is instructive to note that for Eusebius of Emesa, this wrestler is an angel (ἡρξυνωλῳιῦν).⁷⁵ Eusebius of Caesarea, on the contrary, inveighed heavily against precisely this opinion, suggesting that Chrysostom consciously went against the Emesene on these matters, and likewise the Emesene went against his own teacher.

⁷⁰ Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned*, 93.

⁷¹ John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 58.2 (PG 54.509).

⁷² Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned*, 50, locates this tradition in relationship to the theophanic exegesis of Gen 18, which he calls 'speculative trinitarian' traditions (52).

⁷³ John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 43.1 (PG 54.396), *ad Gen.* 19.1, in which God 'in the shape of a human ... communes' (σχήματι ἀνθρώπου ... διαλεγόμενος) with Abraham while the two angels head to Sodom for its harrowing; *Theatr.* 3 (PG 56.546), in which the tent of Abraham hosts Christ 'in human form' (ἐν ἀνθρώπου σχήματι).

⁷⁴ Eusebius of Caesarea, *Dem. Ev.* 5.11.7 (GCS 23.235,7); *Comm. Ps.* 80 (PG 23.969); Cf. Origen, *Cat.* 1657 (TEG 4.92): 'just like, even God' (ὁμοῦ καὶ θεός).

⁷⁵ Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 115a (TEG 15.155).

3 Conclusion

This chapter has provided evidence that Eusebius of Caesarea informed the background of significant aspects of John Chrysostom's non-literal exegesis, and that Chrysostom's criteria for evaluating the success of such readings is inseparable from this resource. When Chrysostom brings up several typologies, such as that of Phares and Zara, he likely used Eusebius of Caesarea's *Question 7 on the Gospel* as a literary source. The discussions of Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore went in different directions. In this vein we also saw that the Caesarean provided the same explanations as Chrysostom regarding typological details in the Blessing of Jacob, over and against his Antiochene predecessors who yet also seemed aware of the text-referent language captured in Eusebius's *Demonstration on the Gospel* 8.

From this vantage point, the Caesarean emerges as an important resource not just for Chrysostom but for other Antiochenes, albeit negatively. Diodore's knowledge of Eusebius's ideas is precise, but he attributes them to the dangerous practice of inserting foreign meaning into a text—allegory against the history, in this case. Diodore's target was not discernibly motivated by theological polemic, suggesting that neither Emperor Julian nor larger Trinitarian or Christological foes were envisioned. Yet Chrysostom, who also at other points in his work witnesses anti-allegorical polemic (see further in the next chapter), decides that on this very point, the 'allegorical' reading is appropriate to unify the whole context of Gen 49–50. We may bear in mind the micro-study of *Homily 67 on Genesis* (Chapter 4.2.3.2) in which Chrysostom coheres prophetic and mimetic referents throughout. Taken with what we have seen in this chapter, the detailed typology based in Eusebius was used to strengthen the wider purposes of his discourse. In Chrysostom's mind, Eusebius's argument sufficiently connected the blessing of Jacob and the birth of Tamar's twins to events in the salvific economy of the life of Christ. Clear linguistic parallels based on biblical word comparisons of expressions like 'rising' and 'barrier' were key to Chrysostom's acceptance of Eusebius's typologies. In this, Chrysostom departs from the conservative one-text-one-*skopos* view.⁷⁶ It is worth emphasizing that Eusebius's argument was centered on the etymology of 'Zara' as 'rising' and 'Phares' as 'barrier' just as much as on the *historia* of Zara stretching out the hand and yet ceding first birth position to Phares—both aspects belong to the exegetical procedure. If we follow Breck's reading of Diodore's understanding of historical typology as containing the essential

76 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 183.

sense in the events and not the words,⁷⁷ then Chrysostom sets himself apart from Diodore's wider hermeneutical reflections.

If Chrysostom was willing to view particular *pericopae* with holistic non-literal referents based on linguistic cross-reference cues, and so multiple *skopoi* within one biblical book, this raises the question of the extent to which he shared resources and explanations with Alexandrian authors. Viewing him in comparative relation to Philo, Origen, and Didymus will illuminate further Chrysostom's standing in Late Antique exegetical tradition.

⁷⁷ Breck, 'Theôria antiochienne', 55.

John Chrysostom among the Alexandrians

In this final chapter, some of Chrysostom's oldest, and in terms of modern categories, seemingly extraneous sources of inspiration will be uncovered. Subsumed under the category of 'the Alexandrians', we primarily envisage the exegetical traditions witnessed in Philo, Origen, and Didymus the Blind. In comparing Chrysostom's material to these authors, we add to an established line of research that has discerned Chrysostom to be a source of positive Antiochene reception of Alexandrian ideas and methods, making him an important vantage point for our understanding of what accounts for the differing exegetical practices witnessed across these authors.

Modern scholars have explored the rapport of John Chrysostom with Alexandrian authors in what may, for our purposes, be distinguished as three dimensions. First, there is the level of comparing their approaches on a topic or broadly construed theme, such as ancient *paideia*, or exegetical approaches to Romans 9–11.¹ These studies are limited for situating Chrysostom and the Alexandrians in precise relationship, often pointing to Chrysostom's social and pastoral context as a determining factor for his different approach.² Second, there are more detailed case studies which attempt to discern specific shared ideas and exegetical concerns emerging from the same texts in Alexandrian authors. Examples of this would be the exegete's self-understanding as searching for 'spiritual treasure' in the Scriptures or the common citations of Pauline texts to explain the human condition in the narrative of the Genesis flood.³ To

- 1 For example, Tloka, *Griechische Christen* for Christianized *paideia* in Chrysostom and Origen; exegetically organized: G. Ferraro, *Lo Spirito Santo nel Quarto Vangelo: i commenti di Origene, Giovanni Crisostomo, Teodoro di Mopsuestia e Cirillo di Alessandria*, OCA 246 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Orientale, 1995) and P. Gorday, *Principles of Patristic Exegesis: Romans 9–11 in Origen, John Chrysostom, and Augustine*, Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 4 (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1983); A. Méhat, 'Divination païenne et prophétie chrétienne', in R.J. Daly (ed.), *Origeniana Quinta*, BETL 105 (Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 436–441 for comparison of Origen and Chrysostom on prophecy and pagan divination practices; Reuling, *After Eden* in which Origen, Didymus, and Chrysostom feature among her sources of comparison; see especially pp. 119–122 for her introduction to Chrysostom and his exegetical method.
- 2 For example, Tloka, *Griechische Christen*, 89 and 204. She locates Origen's development of universal Christian *paideia* in the context of elitist pagan philosophy, whereas for Chrysostom, Christian *paideia* is a 'utopian' (246) political ideology based on euergetism.
- 3 R. Brändle, *Matthäus 25,31–46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostoms. Ein Beitrag zur Auslegungsgeschichte und zur Erforschung der Ethik der griechischen Kirche um die Wende vom 4. Zum*

these may be added comparative notes made in critical editions which indicate that, for instance, in his *Homilies on Matthew*, Chrysostom precisely used terminology and biblical text references also used by Origen.⁴ The cumulative effect of these studies is a considerable amount of common ground between Chrysostom and Alexandrian authors (primarily Origen).⁵ Amirav's work highlights especially their awareness of the same biblical text references in application to specific exegetical arguments, what we have called in the introduction of this volume text-referent webs.⁶ A third and final group considers Chrysostom's reception and possible direct dependence on Alexandrian ideas. Regarding reception, Runia has suggested that 'we should not exclude the possibility that Philonic material is present' in Chrysostom's *œuvre*. This has inspired research such as McFarland's identification of Chrysostom receiving aspects of Philonian 'prepositional metaphysics' regarding the exegesis of some Genesis texts.⁷ To such studies also belong rare cases where direct dependence might

5. *Jahrhundert*, BGBE 22 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979); *ibid.*, 'Zur Interpretation von Mt 25,31–36 im Matthäuskommentar des Origenes', *ThZ* 36 (1980), 17–25; R. Wetzel, *Das vierundzwanzigste Kapitel des Evangelisten Matthäus in der Auslegung durch die griechischen Väter Origenes und Chrysostomus* (Diss. Tübingen, 1978); Astruc-Morize–Le Boulluec, 'Le sens caché'; Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*. Guinot, 'L'école exégétique'; and 'Théodoret a-t-il lu les homélies d'Origène sur l'Ancien Testament?' *Vetera Christianorum* 21 (1984), 285–312, consider the reception of Origen's Old Testament homilies in Antiochene circles; *ibid.*, 'La frontière' considers the reception 'allegory' and 'typology' in Antiochene authors. Guinot has focused on locating Chrysostom within the 'Antiochene reaction' against this Alexandrian, specifically in the use of Gal 4,24 to deny what Antiochenes saw as 'Greek mythologizing' to the bible.

- 4 For example, Klostermann systematically compared Origen's fragments on Matthew to their corresponding location in the *Homilies on Matthew* of Chrysostom and found numerous parallels, at times detailed correspondences. For a case of the latter, see for instance Origen, *Frag. Mt.* 53 (GCS 41/1.36): 'doch ähnelt der Anfang Chrysostomus hom. 12 ... ganz deutlich Chrysostomus ist das ausführlichere „Origenes“-Scholion'.
- 5 Recent scholars have tended to accept that the methodologies of 'Antiochene' and 'Alexandrian' approaches shared much in common despite the construction of past dichotomies, seen e.g. in M. Simonetti, *Littera e/o allegoria: uno contributo alla storia dell'esegesi patristica*, SEA 23 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1985), 182–183, critiqued by Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 299 and Mitchell, *Heavenly Trumpet*, 384.
- 6 Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, esp. 230.
- 7 D.T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*, CRI 3 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993), 270–271; O. McFarland, 'Philo's Prepositional Metaphysics within Early Christian Debates about the Relation of Divine Nature and Agency', *Studia Philonica* (2015), 90–92; 107. Compare John Chrysostom, *In Matt. hom.* 59 (HM 2.183c): 'Scripture had known to say this "through whom", this "under whom"' (οἶδε γὰρ τὸ δι' οὗ, τὸ ὑφ' οὗ λέγειν ἡ γραφή) and Philo, *Cher.* 126 (PAO 1.200,5): 'from which the constitution [of the cosmos]' (ἐξ ἧς ἡ κατασκευή). 'Prepositional metaphysics' describes Aristotle's four distinct causes being assigned to prepositional

be posited, such as the recent article by Esdall.⁸ At each level, these dimensions of research have found significant shared aspects that suggest the fruitfulness of critical comparative analysis on a larger scale. In this chapter, I contribute to these investigations, particularly the second and third facets, by assessing spe-

expressions. Applied to Judeo-Christian theology, the preposition ἐκ, for instance, can connote the agency of God the creator. Significantly, like Philo had, Chrysostom adduced Gen 4,1 and 40,8 as evidence for this argument. While McFarland suggests that Didymus or a source shared by him mediated this tradition to Chrysostom, it is noteworthy that, with Runia, Philonic material is indeed present in Chrysostom. For further discussion of Philo's prepositional metaphysics, see H. Dörrie, 'Präpositionen und Metaphysik: Wechselwirkung zweier Prinzipienreihen', *Museum Helveticum* 26.4 (1969), 217–228 and G.E. Sterling, 'Prepositional Metaphysics in Jewish Wisdom Speculation and Early Christian Liturgical Texts', in D.T. Runia–G.E. Sterling (eds.), *Wisdom and Logos: Studies in Jewish Thought* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), esp. 227. These studies show that his understanding of this issue is based on more than facile reproduction of an isolated passage in Aristotle. This research is corroborated by the findings of Rogers, *Didymus the Blind* and 'The Philonic and the Pauline: Hagar and Sarah in the Exegesis of Didymus the Blind', *Studia Philonica* 26 (2014), 57–77 which, building on Geljon, demonstrate that Didymus, an Alexandrian exegete contemporary to Chrysostom, uses Philo extensively in his *Commentary on Genesis*.

- 8 B.A. Esdall, 'Chrysostom's Use of Origen: Interpreting 1 Corinthians 4:6, Gospel Proof-Texts, and a Case for Direct Dependence', *JThS* 70.1 (2019), 239–250. This article, however, has some methodological flaws, resulting in overstating the case for direct dependence. Esdall's argument rests on three shared attributes of passages from Chrysostom and Origen: four common biblical citations, a relatively lengthy explanatory sentence, and similar introductory formulas. In his consideration of possible reasons for these parallels, Esdall does not consider the fact that this may be due to a common source, namely a Testimony collection. Esdall's own analysis furnishes many of the criteria required for asserting the presence of a Testimony collection: M.C. Albl, *"And Scripture Cannot be Broken": The Form and Function of the Early Christian testimonia Collections*, *NovTSup* 96 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 66; *ibid.* (trans.), *Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa: Testimonies against the Jews*, *WGRW* 8 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2004), XIV–XV: (1) quotations that deviate considerably from known scriptural texts; (2) composite quotations; (3) false attributions; (4) use of the same series of texts in independent authors; (5) editorial or interpretative comments indicative of a collection; (6) evident lack of awareness of the biblical context of a quotation; (7) use of the same exegetical comments in independent authors; cf. J.R. Harris, *Testimonies*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916–1920), 1:8 and below, Chapter 8.7. Finally, Esdall does not sufficiently consider the possibility that, especially because the relevant Origen fragment is transmitted by *catenae*, a compiler may have inserted a passage from Chrysostom's homilies into a comment marked under Origen's *sigla*; see discussion in C. Jenkins, 'The Origen-Citations in Cramer's Catena on 1 Corinthians', *JThS* 6 (1904), 113–116. Even though Jenkins independently confirmed the Origen fragments with reference to *Vat. gr.* 762, there is no way to rule out cross-pollination at an earlier point. While Esdall shows its coherence with the context of Origen's comment, the content of the relevant fragment is not sufficiently 'Origen' enough to argue that it was original to him; a generic statement regarding Christian unity, which is itself heavily reliant on biblical language (see Rom 12,5 and John 10,3) may be adapted in any number of places. Esdall's argument is worth taking seriously, however, so for the purposes of my present cate-

cific exegetical techniques and ideas in the *Homilies on Genesis* in relation to Alexandrian authors, hoping to illuminate the complexity of patristic exegetical traditions and their concomitant text-referent webs. The cumulative result of these correspondences, I suggest, calls for the hypothetical postulation of textual resources available for the composition of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* that incorporated or derived from Alexandrian sources. I assess this relationship from five angles: elucidations, exegetical problems, allegory, typology, and *testimonia*.

1 Elucidations of Biblical Texts

At numerous points in this volume, we have seen that patristic exegetes of diverse contexts shared common elucidations of biblical texts. These common elucidations are often subtle, simple, but consistently transmitted across geographical, ecclesial, and ideological boundaries. While often exegetical of a specific image or text, elucidations did not necessarily concern elaborate explanations. They often came in the form of glosses, paraphrases, common formulations, and references to other biblical texts by way of commenting. A particularly vivid case is seen in the introduction to Chapter 7, where the explanation of the firmament as heavens riding on the 'backs of the waters' was employed by Eusebius of Caesarea and many fourth-century Antiochene authors, Chrysostom among them. Presently, to substantiate that Chrysostom shared with Alexandrians such elucidations, Table 8 provides an overview of select cases. In column 1, I provide the biblical text concerned. The footnotes in this column reference the primary sources which contain parallel elucidations in the corresponding rows. The cases in Table 8 are not intended to suggest Chrysostom's specific sources, but rather illustrate elucidations shared with authors that wrote within the Alexandrian school or *milieu*.⁹

From Table 8 there are five notable aspects concerning Chrysostom's elucidations of Genesis texts in comparison with those of Alexandrians: exegetical intention and technique, shared formulas with Alexandrians, non-Antiochene ideas, references to other biblical texts, and spiritual exegesis.

gorizing of Chrysostom-Origen research, I include his study cautiously, hoping that section 7 of the present chapter demonstrates that a common source in a Testimony Collection is an equally possible explanation in the case of Esdall's interesting discovery.

9 By this expression I mean only that over the course of five centuries (first B.C.E.–fourth C.E.), Philo, Origen, and Didymus lived, trained, taught, and wrote in Alexandria; here I do not envision by 'Alexandrian school' a distinct hermeneutical framework.

TABLE 8 Select elucidations to Genesis texts in John Chrysostom and Alexandrian authors

Genesis text	Chrysostom	Philo, Origen, or Didymus
1,31, ¹⁰ 'Beauty' καλόν	– He praised ἐπήνεσε – Proportion ἀναλογία – Each of the things produced ἕκαστον τῶν γινομένων	– Praiseworthy ἔπαινον – Proportion ἀναλογία – Each of the things produced ἕκαστον τῶν γινομένων
5,29, ¹¹ 'Noah' Νῶε	– Rest ἀνάπαυσις – 'Death is rest for a man' Θάνατος ἀνδρὶ ἀνάπαυσις (LXX-Job 3,23) – To labor πονεῖσθαι	– Rest ἀνάπαυσις – 'Death is rest for a man' Θάνατος ἀνδρὶ ἀνάπαυσις (LXX-Job 3,23) – For laborers πόνοις
8,7, ¹² 'Crow' κόρακα	Unclean ἀκάθαρτον	Clean ὑγιανῆ
11,1, ¹³ 'One lip' χείλος ἓν	– Concordant ὁμόφωνοι – Those confessing ὁμόγλωσσοι – The thing said τὴν λαλίαν – 'For the lips' χείλεσιν (LXX-Ps 140,3)	– The concordance τὸ ὁμόφωνον – The confessors ὁμόγλωττοι – The saying τὸ λαλεῖν – 'For the lips' χείλεσιν (LXX-Ps 140,3)
12,8, ¹⁴ 'Altar' θυσιαστήριον	He gave thanks εὐχαρίστησεν	The thanksgiving εὐχαριστίας
13,14–15, 'To have been sep-	Tract ἐκλογή	Tract ἐκλογή

10 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 4.4 (PG 53.43); 5.5 (PG 53.73); Didymus, *In Gen.* 22; 68 (SC 233.66; 170).

11 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 21.5 (PG 53.182); Didymus, *Comm. Iob* 85,7–31 (PTA 1.242–244); *In Gen.* 188,30 (SC 244.108).

12 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 26.4 (PG 53.234); Philo, *Q. Gen.* 2.38 (AUCHER, 116).

13 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 30.1–2 (PG 53.274–275); Philo, *Conf.* 6, 9 (PAO 2.231,5; 231,21); Didymus, *Frag. Ps.* 1229 (PTS 16.334).

14 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 32.3 (PG 53.296); Didymus, *In Gen.* 223 (SC 244.172,19).

TABLE 8 Select elucidations to Genesis texts in John Chrysostom and Alexandrian authors (*cont.*)

Genesis text	Chrysostom	Philo, Origen, or Didymus
arated' διαχωρισθῆναι ¹⁵		
15,9, ¹⁶ 'Take me' 'λάβε μοι'	– Just as the ancient τὸ παλαιὸν οὕτως – They are confirming βεβαιοῦν	– The ancients οἱ παλαιότατοι – The oath-sacrifice ὀρκωμοσίας – They were confirming ἐβεβαίουν
27,40, ¹⁷ 'By the sword' 'τῇ μαχαίρᾳ'	Warlike πολεμικόν	Warlike ὑπαιτηρικῶς
28,20–22, ¹⁸ 'Bread' 'ἄρτον'	– Food τροφή – 'Substantial' ἐπιούσιος (Mt 6,11) – The desire for heavenly things τὸν τῶν ἐπουρανίων πόθον	– Food τροφή – 'Substantial' ἐπιούσιος (Mt 6,11) – Heavenly things ἐπουράνια

1.1 *Exegetical Intention and Technique*

On a number of occasions from the material in Table 8 above, John Chrysostom is clear that he knows a specific teaching which he would like his audience to learn, gesturing towards the scholastic context of patristic biblical exegesis. His handling of the birds sent out of Noah's ark towards the end of the flood illustrates the point. As the flood subsides, Noah sends out two birds to help him ascertain whether there is dry land (Gen 8,7). One, a crow, does not return. The other, a dove, returned with an olive branch. This distinction between the birds is a detail that seems to be without purpose and hence requires elucidation. In fact, Chrysostom expressed the 'need to explain the reason to [his audi-

15 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 34.4 (PG 53.311); Origen, *Cat.* 910 (TEG 3.22).

16 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 37.2 (PG 53.343); Origen, *Cat.* 953 (TEG 3.49).

17 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 32.3 (PG 53.296); Philo, *Q. Gen.* 4.235 (AUCHER, 432).

18 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 54.5 (PG 54.478); Origen, *De orat.* 27.1, 4, 7 (GCS 3.363,29; 365,9; 367,9).

ence]’ (ἡμᾶς ἀναγκαῖον εἰπεῖν τὴν αἰτίαν) why the crow never returned. Why did Chrysostom feel a ‘need’ here? On the one hand, there is the possibility of pagan criticism, with the inherent similarity of the flood narrative to Deucalion and Pyrrha. Other Christian apologists and exegetes had addressed criticism about this scene, raising the need for exegetes to justify its coherence and meaning.¹⁹ Without reference to such debates, however, the fifth- to sixth-century commentator Severus of Antioch even mentions that the crow’s being placed in the list of unclean animals (ἀκάθαρτον), likely inspired by the list given in Lev 11,15,²⁰ has a ‘mysterious and unspeakable’ (μυστικὴν καὶ ἀπόρητον) meaning.²¹ Thus in Philo we are not surprised to find that the crow and the dove are an allegory of the soul. In Philo’s terms, the dove is ‘clean’ (ὑγιανή), symbolizing virtue; the crow is the opposite, plunging into the waves of fear and desire which destroy life. But for Chrysostom, the crow must have found corpses of men and beasts in the water and remained with them for food. A considerably different reading results from Philo’s and Chrysostom’s knowledge that this text requires discussion in light of the ‘unclean’ animals list.

Elsewhere, a seemingly innocuous expression is singled out for commentary. According to Gen 27,40, Esau shall live ‘by the sword’. But it was not innocuous to Chrysostom. He pauses over this word and exhorts his audience ‘not to be surprised’ (μὴ ξενιζέσθω) at the expression but rather, learn what Scripture ‘is teaching’ (διδάσκει) with ‘precision’ (ἀκριβείας). Our preacher wishes to emphasize with this the bitterness involved in Esau’s lost birthright. He will thereby be ‘warlike’, also the word Philo used to describe this biblical expression. Compared to Philo, then, Chrysostom’s choice of this word seems less like the mechanical result of a methodological approach to Scripture and more the response to shared resources.

From the words collected in Table 8, we also see several uses of the common glossing formula ‘it means’ or ‘instead of’ (ἀντὶ τοῦ), or ‘this is’ (τοσοῦτον).²² Abraham’s ‘altar’ (Gen 12,8), made after receiving the divine promise, ‘means instead [ἀντὶ τοῦ] that Abraham gave thanks for the promises made’. Similarly, when Jacob prays to God for bread, Chrysostom pauses to ensure that his audience knows that this ‘means instead [ἀντὶ τοῦ] the sustenance of the

19 Origen, *C. Cels.* 4.42 (SVC 54.259,6) witnesses Celsus’s objection that this text was ‘fictive’ (πλάσματῶδες). The Christian apologetic tradition on this point is outlined by C.J. Collins, ‘Noah, Deucalion, and the New Testament’, *Biblica* 93 (2012), 415–419.

20 See further Harl, *La Genèse*, 137 and P. Harlé–D. Pralon, *Le Lévitique*, BA 3 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1988), 128 for description of other Jewish and early Christian texts which use this in symbolic interpretation.

21 Severus of Antioch, *Frag. III Rg.* 49 (TEG 14.136).

22 See in this volume, Chapter 1.1 and 4.1.

day'. When the text mentions that God deems creation 'beautiful', Chrysostom insists that his audience 'understand the word in a way befitting of God' (θεο-πρεπῶς νόει τὸ ῥηθὲν), which is to say that God 'praised' creation.²³ These markers in the text of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* around word-explanations shared with Alexandrian authors strengthens the case that in the form we have these *Homilies*, the author did not envision such elucidations haphazardly. Further comparison bears out this impression that a significant aspect of his word-explanations was based in shared exegetical traditions with Alexandrian authors.

1.2 *Shared Words and Formulations with Alexandrians*

Looking closer at this previous example regarding Gen 1,31, 'God saw that it was beautiful', we see Chrysostom share with an Alexandrian author several formulas applied to a specific biblical text. Both Didymus and Chrysostom deem that God 'praised' creation. Further, they specify which attribute God found most praiseworthy: its 'proportion' (ἀναλογία).²⁴ Thus, they explain further that God praised 'each of the things created', here using the exact same formula: ἕκαστον τῶν γινομένων. The supposition that God 'praised' creation in calling it 'beautiful' is found in Philo and many early Christian authors.²⁵ Some of these even offer similar formulas that we have seen Chrysostom and Didymus use, such as Basil claiming that God 'praised each thing' (ἐπαινεῖ τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον) or Philo adding that the 'proportion' of creation was particularly noteworthy. However, Chrysostom agrees most with Didymus in this case, given their references to 'proportion', the precise correspondence of their formulas, and the context of commentary on Gen 1,31 in particular. These ideas are not found in what sur-

23 Didymus too envisioned a didactic moment in his commentary, as he used a similar formula to express the same gloss: 'this word ['beautiful'] means praise' (τοσοῦτον δὲ ἔπαινον ῥητέον).

24 For translation as 'proportion', see Lampe, *Lexicon*, 111; C. Larcher, *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou la Sagesse de Salomon*, vol. III (Paris: Gabalda, 1985), 763–764 for the adverbial form of this word (Wis 13,5) as 'proportionally'; discussion in patristic authors, Elliott, 'Wisdom of Solomon', 13–15.

25 Philo, *Quis rerum*, 159–160 (OPA 15,242–243), 'by praising it [ἐπαινοῦντι], it possesses equal honor', and further in the passage mentions its 'proportion' (ἀναλογίας); Clement, *Strom.* 6.12.101 (GCS 52.482,29–483,2), after mentioning the Gen 1,31 expression 'saw that it was beautiful', says that 'just as an architect praised [ἐπῆνεσεν] the thing made, so too God when he made light'; ἐπῆνεσεν is used similarly as a gloss of Gen 1,31 in Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 3.10 (GCS NF 2.55); Amphilochius, *C. Haer.* 21,783 (CCSG 3.205); Asterius, *Hom.* 7.5.1 (DATEMA, 74,27–31); Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 38.10 (SC 358.122,6–7); Gregory of Nyssa, *Hex.* 12 (GNO 4/1.23).

vives of Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa's commentaries. This intriguing case demonstrates that Chrysostom was well-versed in common Alexandrian traditions.

On a much smaller scale we see common terminology applied to the same biblical text. For instance, Abraham and Lot make a division among the land in their position (13,14), and both Origen and Chrysostom understand this to be the creation of a 'selection' (ἐκλογή); Eusebius of Emesa did not comment on this text in his *Commentary on Genesis*. Like with the choice of the word 'warlike' common to Philo, a precise glossular term occurs.

While not strong cases on their own, and certainly not permitting conclusions of dependence of Chrysostom on these Alexandrian texts, together these examples show Chrysostom adopting with a range of precision various terminology and ideas for elucidating Genesis texts known by Alexandrian authors. They showcase how difficult it is to be precise about the logic behind Chrysostom's choices, posing the possibility that his literal elucidations derive just as much from a pool of resources as they do a hermeneutical conviction.

1.3 *Non-Antiochene Ideas*

Some of the previous cases are of limited value because the surviving material from other Antiochenes does not adequately permit comprehensive comparison. However, there are a few cases where Chrysostom followed Alexandrian glosses and references when his Antiochene contemporaries and predecessors clearly went another direction. These cases are subtle but important for substantiating the role of Alexandrian-shared resources in his *Homilies on Genesis*.

We already saw that, like Philo, Chrysostom understands Esau's character as 'warlike' (πολεμικόν / պատերազմ),²⁶ a gloss on the expression 'He shall live by the sword [μαχαίρᾳ]'. In itself this is not a move of linguistic ingenuity, as we are dealing with only a simple inference. But it is interesting to compare Eusebius of Emesa. The Emesene chooses a word that is closer to the biblical text, describing Esau as 'battlesome' (μάχιμον / կռուող).²⁷ Thus, we have a rather full view of this tiny word: it went beyond the Antiochene restatement of the biblical text and into a more vivid glossular explanation.

At other points, Chrysostom shares formulas and ideas with both Antiochenes and Alexandrians but elaborates the sense of the passage in greater align-

26 R. Marcus, 'An Armenian-Greek Index to Philo's *Quaestiones* and *De Vita Contemplativa*', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 53.3 (1933), 276 confirms that for the translator of Philo's *QG* into Armenian from Greek, պատերազմ is a normal rendering of πόλεμος.

27 Eusebius of Emesa *apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad 27,34* (GCS NF 22.333,41) / *Comm. Gen.* 104 (TEG 15.146).

ment with the latter. Origen, Diodore, and Chrysostom all witness a similar description of the oath which God asks Abraham to make in Gen 15,9. God commands Abraham to 'take to me' a list of animals, presumably for sacrifice. Our exegetes explain this command as a custom by which the ancients would 'confirm' their oaths, all three using forms of *βεβαιούν* and *παλαιός* to explain this confirmation act.²⁸ They thus shared a common framework of considerably detailed exegetical problem-obscurity identification and explanatory terminology. But Origen goes on to specify that, despite the appearance of the contrary, this is actually a command for Abraham 'not to make a sacrifice' (οὐ θύειν). So too Chrysostom: it is an agreement for Abraham to 'establish his soul' (στηρίζαι τὴν ψυχὴν) in faith. Not so for Diodore, who admits openly that the animals were laid out in accordance with 'a law of sacrifice' (θυσίων νόμον).

In the same vein, as has already been noted above (Chapter 5.5.2), Chrysostom and Didymus shared the explanation of 'altar' with 'thanksgiving', against Eusebius of Emesa who viewed this as a 'heritage' and explicitly said that it does not concern prayer. Chrysostom references to 1 Tim 2,8 to justify his explanation, saying that Abram here 'anticipates' what is 'fulfilled' in the New Testament. The shape of Didymus' exegesis is similar. The passage (which has *lacunae*) does not include reference to the Pauline 'hands of prayer' but it does use Pauline texts to discuss prayer in the full Spirit of adopted children of God, visting the 'Our Father' (Mt 6,9) and Paul's mention that such prayer is made 'only in the Spirit' (1 Cor 12,3).²⁹

These examples do not demonstrate conclusively a specific Alexandrian source for Chrysostom. Rather, they suggest that Chrysostom was aware of resources also shared by Alexandrian authors, a kind of underlying thread to the webs of patristic exegetical traditions, and he could discern when he wished to use these ideas in subtle contrast to his Antiochene predecessors.

1.4 *Biblical Text and Spiritual Referents*

There is further evidence for this nuanced positioning between exegetical webs when we consider how Chrysostom explained some of the words from Table 8 with reference to other biblical texts, and how these couplets are grounds for a non-literal referent, often focused on moral psychology or historical typology.

For instance, in Gen 28,20, Jacob asks the divine for bread in a manner reminiscent of a similar petition in the Lord's prayer. In the Genesis text, it is 'Give me bread' (δῶ μοι ἄρτον), while in the Gospel parallels, it is 'Give us bread' (τὸν

28 Diodore, *Coisl.* 188 (CCSG 15,185–186).

29 Didymus, *In Gen.* 224,3 (SC 244,174).

ἄρτον δὲς ἡμῖν, Mt 6,11/Lk 11,3). Both Chrysostom and Origen quote these texts in parallel. Further, they share the same glossular definition of ‘bread’. Chrysostom says that this bread ‘means instead the sustenance [τροφήν] of the day’,³⁰ and Origen says that ‘in the scriptures “bread” is always spoken of as sustenance [τροφή]’.³¹ Berglund remarks that Origen’s approach in this passage is ‘one of his most expansive word studies’ showcasing his method of arriving at a deeper understanding of the text through grammatical-rhetorical analysis.³² A scholastic context undergirds the reception of this text in other authors as well. As such, this gloss was known by Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa,³³ but they do not compare the texts of Gen 28,20 and Mt 6,11/Lk 11,3 as Origen and Chrysostom. Further, these latter two shared the mention of an adjective used to describe the ‘bread’ in the passages of the Lord’s prayer, ‘substantial’ (ἐπίσπουσιος). For Chrysostom, the sense of these petitions for bread is thereby best understood as an ‘asking for the desire of heavenly things’ (αἰτεῖν ... εἰς τὸν τῶν ἐπουρανίων πόθον). Multiple texts from Matthew’s gospel illuminate the situation further: those asking for these heavenly things are ready to forfeit their own soul (16,26); those asking for these things seek first the kingdom of heaven (6,33). For his part, Origen sees in Mt 6,11 the ‘asking for heavenly and magnificent things’ (αἰτεῖν ἐπουράνια καὶ μεγάλα).³⁴ While the specific overlap is minimal from a philological standpoint, and so not a strong case on which to build dependence, these two exegetes used common elucidation techniques to set the petition for bread in the context of prayer and spiritual progress.³⁵

Another specific text-referent couplet Chrysostom shares with an Alexandrian author concerns the onomastic interpretation of Noah. Both Didymus and Chrysostom know that his name means ‘relief’, and indeed much early Christian and Jewish interpretation rehearsed this idea in connection with

30 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 54.5 (PG 54.478).

31 Origen, *De orat.* 27.4 (GCS 3.365,9).

32 Berglund, ‘Interpreting Readers’, 235. With P. Van Deun, ‘ΕΥΧΗ distingué de ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΗ: un essai de précision terminologique chez les pères grecs et les écrivains byzantins’, in J. Den Boeft (ed.), *The Impact of Scripture in Early Christianity*, SVC 44 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 202–222, this passage contained a precise distinction of terminology that would influence later authors.

33 Gregory of Nyssa, *Orat.* 4 (GNO 7/2.50,28; 52,2–3); Basil of Caesarea, *Reg. brev.* 252 (PG 31.1252).

34 Origen, *De orat.* 27.1 (GCS 3.363,29).

35 Compare *De orat.* 13.4 (GCS 3.328,8–10); the theme occurs elsewhere, as discussed in L. Perrone, ‘Il discorso protrettico di Origene sulla preghiera. Introduzione al Περί Εὐχῆς’, in F. Cocchini (ed.), *Il dono e la sua ombra: ricerche sul Περί Εὐχῆς di Origene. Atti del I Convegno del Gruppo Italiano di Ricerca su ‘Origene e la Tradizione Alessandrina’*, SEA 57 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1997), 7–32.

Noah's 'righteousness'.³⁶ Chrysostom connects the 'death' mentioned in the Job text with the metaphorical death of Adam's curse of working the ground. Another way to understand this curse is that it is the introduction of 'evil' (κακία) into the cosmos. So, Noah is 'a rest for the labors' (πόνους ἀνάπαυσις) of evil's havoc.³⁷ The need for producing a unifying metaphorical sense to the 'death' of Genesis 2–3 arises due to a seeming contradiction in the Scriptures. God had said earlier to Adam that if he eats of the tree, he would be cursed and 'die' (Gen 2,17b). But after his disobedience, Adam is cursed to 'work' the ground (Gen 3,17)—he is not smitten to death! This metaphorical death is for Chrysostom 'the condition of distress and difficulty'.³⁸ Noah, Chrysostom says, brings us relief from this distress which has ransacked the world since the beginning. Through death, the death of the whole world except Noah and his family, the divine benevolently opens the door for new possibilities for virtue. The concise statement of Job, inspired by the onomastic interpretation of Noah, thereby becomes a lucid if daunting framework to view the opening five chapters of the bible. The Septuagint offers terminology for its own elucidation, but Chrysostom uses an onomastic tradition in order to make emphases for comprehension.

Didymus and Chrysostom are the only two known authors who use the apt variant of LXX-Job 3,23 to explain the name 'Noah'. Using the same terminology in the onomastic interpretation, the Job text reads that 'Death is relief for a man'—clearly supplying Chrysostom's thought on the matter. Then, like Chrysostom, Didymus allegorizes the curse of death as the curse of working the ground mentioned in Gen 3,17, stating that death is release from this labor, more specifically the release from the curse of Adam's earthly labor. Like Chrysostom, he then connects this curse to a greater problem. For Chrysostom it was

36 Didymus, *Comm. Iob ad* 3,23 (PTA 1.242; *ibid.* 242,7; 244,31). This word is also given in Philo, *Leg.* 3.77 (PAO 1.129,22), where it is interchangeable with 'righteousness' (δικαιοσύνη); typological and allegorical uses in Theophilus, *Ad Aut.* 3.19 (GRANT, 124), Origen, *Hom. Gen.* 2.3 (GCS NF 17.43,13–14), and Ambrose, *De Noe* 1.2 (CSEL 32/1.413,17), with further outlines and presentation of witnesses in Wutz, *Onomastica sacra*, 1102, 115–116 and Alexandre, *Le commencement*, 394–395. 'Righteousness' appears in Jewish sources such as the Midrash and *1 Enoch*, but Chrysostom does not much discuss this idea; see L.L. Grabbe, *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation. The Hebrew Names in Philo*, Brown Judaic Studies 115 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988), 192.

37 John Chrysostom, *In Gen.* 21.5 (PG 53.182; FOC 82.62).

38 *Ibid.*, *mod.*: 'This means he will free us from all the evil's encumbering us and from the condition of distress and difficulty affecting the earth by the imposition of the curse on account of the transgression of the first formed human being' (ἐλευθερώσει ἡμᾶς πάντων, φησί, τῶν ἐπικειμένων κακῶν, καὶ τοῦ περὶ τὴν γῆν πονεῖσθαι καὶ ταλαιπωρεῖσθαι τὴν κατάραν δεξαμένην διὰ τὴν τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου παράβασιν).

generic 'evil', for Didymus it is more specifically 'the faculty of the passions' (τὸν παθητικόν). Both authors understand Noah's significance in a universal sense: he is relief from the labor set upon the human race, echoing the 'second Adam' theme found already in Philo.³⁹ These connections indicate a thick web of shared exegetical resources within a common scholastic culture.

With Didymus Chrysostom shares another text-couplet and exegetical strategy. The narrative of the Tower of Babel begins by announcing that the whole earth was of 'one lip' (χείλος ἓν, Gen 11,1). Chrysostom and Didymus know this word 'lip' to mean 'language', a rather obvious deduction known by other early Christian authors.⁴⁰ But they substantiate this idea with reference to LXX-Ps 139,4, a biblical text that other authors do not bring into discussions of the tower of Babel. This Psalter text mentions men with 'poisonous lips', which in the ensuing context, use 'tongues' or 'languages' (γλῶσσαι) to slander the psalmist. Chrysostom and Didymus could, then, reason that prior to the tower of Babel, all humanity spoke the same language. Didymus takes far more seriously the spiritual psychology of the one slandered by such tongues. Chrysostom thereby follows the Alexandrian moral interpretation of the Babel narrative as speaking primarily about the human passions.⁴¹ In Origen's formulations, the text here speaks of the initial 'concord' (ὁμόνοια) of the human race, which is associated with 'virtue' (ἀρετή). On the other hand, there is the ensuing 'division' (διαίρεσις) which breeds 'evil' (κακία). Chrysostom reprises this terminology at one point. Babel occurs 'so that you might learn how great an evil is division [κακὸν ἢ διαίρεσις], and how great a good is concord [ὁμόνοια]'.⁴²

It is one thing to use common formal techniques, such as the rare variant of Job 3,23 or the tradition that God 'praised' creation. But when we see Chrysostom developing based on these forms the same spiritual content as Alexandrians, it speaks to the points where Chrysostom may be tested regarding his own hermeneutical rule, namely to provide allegorical or typological referents where the text itself warranted. From this perspective, it appears the closely

39 See further discussion of Didymus on this point in R.A. Layton, *Didymus the Blind and His Circle in Late-Antique Alexandria. Virtue and Narrative in Biblical Scholarship* (Campaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2004), 73. Compare further Harl, *La Genèse*, 142 and Philo, *Q. Gen.* 2.66 (OPA 33,120): 'And it likens Noah to the firstformed human being' (ἐξομοιοῖ δὲ τὸν Νῶε τῷ πρώτῳ διαπλασθέντι ἀνθρώπῳ), followed by Ambrose, *De Noe* 29,107–108 (CSEL 32/1.485–487).

40 Harl, *La Genèse*, 147–148; e.g., Gregory of Nyssa, *Eun.* 2.253 (GNO 1.300): εἰς ποικίλας γλωσσῶν διαφορὰς.

41 Philo, *Conf.* 6–13 (PAO 2.231–232); Origen, *Cat.* 851 (TEG 2.209); Gregory of Nyssa, *C. Eun.* 2.253 (GNO 1.300); Didymus, *Frag. Ps.* 573a (PTS 16.11,12–13).

42 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 30.3 (PG 53.325).

shared web of text-referents and application of exegetical techniques provides him material from which to draw and make these decisions in accordance with what he discerned to be fitting for the liturgical context of his discourse.

2 Exegetical Discussion

The vantage point of word-elucidations is limited; the dossier of content shared between Chrysostom and the Alexandrians thickens with more compelling results when we consider more complex exegetical discussion classified according to some of the broader methodological concerns of ancient exegetes. As Young identified, an essential contextual element of early Christian exegetical culture was its view that the 'mind' or 'aim' of Scripture was clarified by a truth elsewhere in Scripture, a technique highlighting the coincidence of words, expressions, and phrases.⁴³ What sharpens the 'scholastic' element of this culture is the extent of shared traditions of reference. Thus, to address contradiction or redundancy, Chrysostom knew many problems in the biblical text similarly raised by Alexandrians, and he often knew aspects of the same solutions.

2.1 *Moral Propriety*

One of the basic concerns of textual commentary in antiquity was establishing the moral appropriateness of what might otherwise be scandalous episodes. At points, like their pagan counterparts, Christian commentators resorted to allegory to save the surface value of the text.⁴⁴ But at others, through emphasizing particular details, commentators could find on the surface of the text useful material for moral instruction. Cases of moral propriety do not necessarily presuppose pagan criticism, but, recalling Thome's study of Diodore, Theodore, and Julian and what we know of questions-and-answers literature, it is often possible to find exegetical traditions developing in strong parallel to such criticisms.

A fruitful Scriptural site from which to view this nexus is the problem of incest and intermarriage among Old Testament characters, particularly in Genesis. Julian had spoken of 'transgressive marriages' (γάμους παρανόμους) in Greek mythology,⁴⁵ describing Zeus's marriage to his mother, which Julian took as a smokescreen signaling the right to allegory, a right he denied to biblical

43 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 133–136.

44 Dorival, 'Sens de l'écriture', 428–429.

45 Julian, *C. Gal.* fr. 4 [Mas] *apud* Cyril of Alexandria, *C. Jul.* 2.11.3 (GCS NF 20.100).

traditions. Were such concerns turned against the Christian bible? Celsus had judged the account of Lot's daughters as 'iniquitous', but according to Origen's quotation did not explain why, even though Celsus did charge Christians as being incestuous elsewhere.⁴⁶ Direct evidence is lacking for specific criticism of the biblical text, then. But it is clear that patristic exegetical tradition discussed the problem frequently.

This is on display when Christian commentators addressed the case of Cain's progeny. In Gen 4,17, we are told that Cain 'knew a wife'. The careful reader realized that the biblical text had not yet recounted the birth of another woman; the implication, then, is that Cain committed incest with his sisters or his mother and the situation was brought about from divine design. Chrysostom knew precisely this inquiry. 'Someone [τις] might say how' Cain could have progeny, as it suggests that he had intercourse with his sisters (ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς συγγενέσθαι).⁴⁷ Alexandrians knew this problem as well. For Didymus, 'some people are inquiring [ζητοῦσί τινες] from where', apart from incest (ἀδελφογαμία), Cain 'knew a wife?'⁴⁸

Philo and Origen both discuss this problem, leading Rogers to suggest that one of these earlier Alexandrian authors may be the 'someone' behind the objection raised by Didymus, and so, we may infer, by Chrysostom as well.⁴⁹ The likelihood of a shared source finds further support when considering that both Chrysostom and Didymus use the same terminology to answer the incest objection posed to the pericope of Lot and his daughters. While admittedly bizarre, incest is justified in this case for ensuring the 'succession' (διαδοχή) of the human race. It is notable that Diodore also handled this objection from the perspective of someone who 'might question' (ζητοίη), and that he also shares the terminology of 'polygamy' and 'succession' seen in Chrysostom and Didymus.⁵⁰ Diodore, however, witnessed a different objection regarding Cain's

46 Origen, *C. Cels.* 4.45 (SVC 52.262,4–17); Cook, *Old Testament*, 104–105.

47 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 20.1 (PG 53.167).

48 Didymus, *In Gen.* 137 (SC 233.316).

49 Origen, *Hom. Gen.* 5.4 (GCS NF 17.93,9–16), who sees a need to discuss the 'intention' (*propositum*) of Lot's daughters; Philo, *Post.* 33 (PAO 2.8,18–22), who finds it necessary to 'inquire' (διαπορήσαι) about the fact that Genesis text nowhere mentions other women (οὐδεμιᾶς ἄλλης). But unlike Didymus and Chrysostom, Philo's discussion allegorizes Cain's choice of a wife: she is the 'impious reasoning capacity' concerned with mere 'opinion' (ἀσεβοῦς λογισμοῦ ... δόξαν). Chrysostom's statement of the problem looks similar to that of Philo, but his answer shares more in common with Didymus. Rogers, *Didymus the Blind*, 91 suggests that Didymus follows Philo on this point.

50 Diodore, *Coisl.* 135 (CCSG 15.136). Diodore's exegesis here may be summarized as follows. Gen 5,6 tells of Seth, the son of Adam and Eve born after Cain's murder of Abel. If Adam is really from the earth (Gen 2,7), where exactly did other women come from? Are they

incest. To avoid the authorization of incest, did God create men and women from the earth, as in the case of Adam? It is remarkable that Didymus shared the same question, answer, and explanatory terminology as Chrysostom, and that with Diodore there is awareness of a general problem (incest) but clear distinction in the specification of the question posed.

Elsewhere, Chrysostom was aware of a potentially problematic case regarding Noah's father, Lamech. Since Noah was the only righteous man of the earth at the time, Lamech may be presumed to be wicked. It is strange, then, that Lamech can speak 'proleptically' (προρρησεως) about his son, for he declares that Noah will bring relief to the world (Gen 5,25).⁵¹ 'Someone might say [τις εἴποι], how' Lamech can speak like this, as it implies that the biblical text elevates wicked men to venerable positions. Chrysostom encourages his audience 'not to be surprised [ξενισθῆς]' by this point, as the divine works in similar ways elsewhere in the bible. For example, Caiaphas, a manifestly evil ruler, prophesied the death of Jesus (John 11,51). Another example is Balaam, who despite being urged to curse Israel, in fact prophesied of the Messiah (Nm 22,9–35). Origen addresses the question of wicked men prophesying as well. Like Chrysostom, his examples are Lamech, Caiaphas, and Balaam.⁵² Origen affirms that despite the wickedness of these characters, they actually prophesied, and that the bible does not advocate their wickedness as such but illustrates the ingenuity of divine providence.

Another point where patristic exegetes shared knowledge of how similarly to ask and answer potentially morally problematic texts occurs in the case of Noah's drunkenness. The biblical text records that after making it through the flood, Noah tilled the ground, came up with wine, and became intoxicated (Gen 9,20–21). Given that Noah was viewed as a model of virtue, does the biblical text condone this behavior? Chrysostom knows it is 'worthy to inquire' (ἄξιον ζητῆσαι) on this point,⁵³ and Eusebius of Emesa also finds a 'question' here (ἑνὴν ἐ).⁵⁴ But it is likely that here, and in other episodes relating to

not from the earth as well? Further, Lev 18,6–16 prohibits 'incest' (ἀδελφογαμίας), so 'it would seem that' (ὥστω) the descendants of Adam and Eve 'became from the earth' (τοῦ ἐκ γῆς γενέσθαι). Diodore admits that this is a compelling solution to the problem of incest. But the text does not warrant it. Adam's sons prolong the 'successions' (διαδοχαίς) by the unusual 'providential overseeing' (οἰκονομήσαντος) admittance of brothers marrying their sisters.

51 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 21.5 (PG 53.181).

52 Origen, *In Jo.* 28.13–15 (GCS 10.404–408); 28.20–21 (ibid., 415).

53 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 29.3 (PG 53.264).

54 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 51a (TEG 15.100).

drunkenness in Genesis,⁵⁵ their common source was Origen. A small fragment from the *catenae* indicates that Origen was already concerned with the same problem: 'Noah did not know the nature of the wine, that it would make him drunk' (οὐκ ᾔδει Νῶε τὴν τοῦ οἴνου φύσιν ὅτι μεθύσει). He bases this on the Genesis text which says that 'Noah was the first man as cultivator of the earth' (9,20). The word 'first' indicates to Origen that Noah was ignorant of the properties of wine which make men drunk. Chrysostom, Basil, and Eusebius of Emesa use this same explanation with terminology that indicates a common source. In Chrysostom, Noah shows here 'great ignorance' (πολλὴν ἄγνοιαν), not knowing the 'use of the grape plant' (φυτοῦ τὴν χρῆσιν) for drunkenness.⁵⁶ Basil sees here proof of Noah's 'inexperience' (ἀπειρίας) with wine, 'being ignorant' (ἀγνοῶν) of its 'use' (χρῆσιν). For his part, Eusebius of Emesa knows that 'some say' (λέγουσιν) that even though the grape 'plant' (φυτὸν) existed prior to the flood, Noah discovered wine and so was ignorant of its 'use' (χρῆσιν).⁵⁷ With the proliferated awareness of this question-and-answer, it is impossible to reconstruct a chain of transmission. But it raises the likelihood that Origen's work in some way was incorporated into a widely-available scholastic resource.

The case for Origen's influence on the exegesis of the Noachic episode finds further support when Chrysostom produces yet another *zētēma* in conjunction with the previous. He says that 'here again another question [ζήτημα] arises to us', and that 'it is the much discussed one [πολυθύλλητον], tossed around everywhere'. 'Why' (τίνος ἔνεκεν), if Cham was responsible for viewing his father's naked drunkenness, does his son Canaan bear the 'curse' (κατάραν)?⁵⁸ Answer: Cham is to blame for having a son in the first place; this fact makes him impious. Further, this prefigures institutional slavery. Finally, seeing your son punished is itself quite a punishment. Origen's question-and-answer on this second point projects on similar lines. 'Why' (τί δήποτε), when Cham is the 'impious one' (ἀσεβής), does the son receive the 'curse' (κατάραν)?⁵⁹ On the descendants of Cham is focused the curse in order to leave the sons of Noah rightly untarnished by it, he answers—Chrysostom too was concerned about the curse contradicting the blessing of the sons of Noah in Gen 9,1. If Cham was cursed, so too would his brothers be. Eusebius of Emesa offers brief comments on this aspect

55 Already Guinot, 'L'exégèse allégorique d'Homer', 107–108 has suggested that Chrysostom and Theodoret may be understood as giving allegorical exegesis of Lot's drunkenness, not with Origen as their direct source necessarily, but as offering compelling solutions to texts which posed moral quandaries.

56 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 29.2 (PG 53.264).

57 Eusebius of Emesa, *Cat.* 781 (TEG 2.174).

58 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 28.4 (PG 53.257).

59 Origen, *Coisl.* 160 (CCSG 15.156–157).

of the episode, and repeats the idea found in Origen that Cham was cursed because he shared the ‘certain likeness’ (ὁμοῦντιν ὡμοιότην) of his son.⁶⁰ But Eusebius is less clear about Cam’s original impiety, which Chrysostom and Origen argued.

This last point can be magnified by another linguistic parallel between Origen and Chrysostom, this time addressing a potential redundancy in the list of Noah’s sons (Gen 9,18). They are Sem, Japheth, and Cham. But to this list, the text immediately adds that ‘Cham was the father of Canaan’. For Chrysostom ‘here it is worth questioning why [ζητῆσαι τίνος ἔνεκεν]’ the text ‘added’ (προσέθηκεν) this line.⁶¹ Scripture, according to Chrysostom, ‘wishes’ (βούλεται) to indicate the fact that Cham will soon be cursed because of his son’s actions. Origen discusses this same problem with the same terminology. ‘Why’ (Τί δήποτε), he asks, does this text ‘add’ (προσέθηκεν) this line that ‘Cham was the father of Canaan?’⁶² For Origen, the Spirit authoring the text ‘wants’ (βουλόμενον) to explain the likeness of the father to the son in this case, so that the coming curse of Cham will be made intelligible—the same explanation in Chrysostom. Eusebius of Emesa, it is noteworthy, does not discuss this ‘addition’ of Canaan’s parentage. From this vantage point, somehow, Origen’s work was available to both Eusebius of Emesa and Chrysostom through a format which they could develop in separate directions. These comments likely derived from the *Scholia on Genesis*,⁶³ as discussion of the ‘addition’ of Canaan’s name, for instance, does not occur in Rufinus’s translation of the *Homilies on Genesis*. In either case, the Origen work used by Chrysostom related to that used by the Genesis-catenist from which these fragmentary comments come to us.

60 Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 34 (TEG 15,82); cf. 51b (ibid., 102).

61 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 28.4 (PG 53,256).

62 Origen, *Coisl.* 160,9 (CCSG 15,156).

63 Thanks to the work of Petit and Metzler, we can be almost certain that Origen produced a work of *Scholia* on Genesis, even though Jerome did not include it in his testimony of *Letter* 33. This letter mentions Origen’s 13-volume *Commentary on Genesis* alongside his *Homilies on Genesis*, *Exodus-scholia*, and *Leviticus-scholia*. Metzler, *Prokop*, GCS NF 22.CXV–CXVIII clarifies that the Genesis-*scholia* stretch from Gen 5,1–49,9. This work was known to the *Urkaten* source, used by Procopius and the Genesis catenist. The issue of on which books Origen wrote *scholia* is admirably discussed (with reference to Jerome’s testimony) by Ch. Marksches, ‘Scholien bei Origenes und in der zeitgenössischen wissenschaftlichen Kommentierung’, in S. Kaczamark–H. Pietras (eds.), *Origen as Writer. Papers of the 10th International Origen Congress, University of Philosophy and Education “Ignatianum”, Kraków, Poland. 31 August–4 September 2009*, BETL 244 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), esp. 148–150.

2.2 *Contradiction*

In his *Homilies on Genesis*, Chrysostom also addressed potentially contradictory passages. This was a common technique of ancient commentary.⁶⁴ But some of Chrysostom's discussions on these issues directly parallel those of Alexandrian authors, suggesting that his raising of these points derived from scholarly resources. In two cases, based on the evidence available, Chrysostom did not inherit these problems from the commentaries on Genesis of his Antiochene predecessors.

First, Chrysostom mentions 'the raised problem [ζήτημα] to us' in the face of Gen 2,3 and John 5,17.⁶⁵ In the Genesis text, God 'rested' after completing his work of creation on the sixth day. This seems a 'contradiction' (ἐναντίως) of a saying in the Gospel of John. There, Jesus says that the Father is 'working until even now'. Does the creator cease his labor, or is he always working? There is a 'teaching mysteriously' (αἰνιγματωδῶς διδασκαλίαν) here, Chrysostom says. Despite the mention of pause in Gen 2,3, Chrysostom affirms that God's constant work is his 'providential care' (πρόνοιαν) of 'the human race' (τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος). Even though preserved in Latin, Origen's addressing of the same problem is discernible. After quoting Gen 2,3 and John 5,17 as a potential contradiction, Origen insists that God never ceases his providential care of the world and the human race (*a dispensationibus mundi et a provisionibus generis humani*).⁶⁶ It is notable that while Chrysostom does not follow Origen's peculiar allegory here, he does claim his resolution to the same contradiction as a 'mysterious teaching'.

64 For discussion of the role of contradiction in Homeric commentary, see R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 69–70. An illustrative concern in Homeric commentary is in Porphyry, *Quaest. Hom. ad Il.* 6,265 (TK 36.116), where 'it is asked how' the poet is 'contradictory of himself' (ἐναντία ἑαυτῷ)—the same expression used in Christian commentary—but the critic can solve the problem by distinguish between the poet's 'own person' (ἐξ ἰδίου προσώπου) and that of the characters of the poem, or between characters themselves, such as here between Hekabe and Hector. For Theodore's addressing Psalter texts in the same way, see Schäublin, *Untersuchungen*, 63; for sequence in Origen, Martens, *Origen*, 59–61.

65 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 11.7 (PG 53.89).

66 Origen, *Hom. Num.* 23.4 (GCS 30.216,23–24). He provides an allegorical framework for this problem not witnessed in Chrysostom. Origen, *ibid.* (216,7–8): 'This is a place of his righteousness ... which is Christ, the place of the soul' (*iustitia locus eius est ... quae Christus est, locus animae est*). Similar discussions are found in other patristic authors: Ambrose, *Exp. Ev. Luc.* 7.173–174 (CCSL 14.274); Anon., *Cat.* 184 (TEG 1.130). Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad 2,2* (GCS NF 22, 88,29–37) cites John 5,17 to clarify that God never fully stops from his work, so too Jerome, *Ep.* 131.11 (CSEL 56.211–212).

Another case concerned the repetition of a term in the creation narrative. Gen 2,6 says that a 'source [πηγή] rose up from the earth'. It is presumed that this 'source' is the fountainhead of the four rivers that are explained in the next verse. However, shortly thereafter, in Gen 2,10, the same word 'source' is found 'proceeding out of Eden'.⁶⁷ Chrysostom knows the opinion that these texts are 'contradictory' (ἀπεναντίας) to one another, a position he ascribes to those 'loving to quarrel' (φιλονεικεῖν).⁶⁸ For him 'great treasure is concealed [ἐγκεκρυμμένος θησαυρός] in these few words', and it must be 'unfurled' (ἀναπτύξαι). The stakes are rather high, Chrysostom goes on to reveal, for on the basis of these texts, one could argue that the earth receives its sustenance and fertility from this 'source', instead of from divine providence. That is the real contradiction Chrysostom wishes to address, but it is rooted in the problematic sequence of Gen 2,9–10. Those who held this opinion according to Chrysostom thereby saw that the 'source' of the earth's life was 'from moisture gushing' (ὑετῶν ἐπομβρίας) or 'a little humidity' (μικρὰν νοτίδα). This view is based in Philo. He addressed Gen 2,6 at several points in his *œuvre*. Once, he argues that from this 'source' comes the 'humidity' (νοτίς) of the earth, which makes it the 'most fertile' (γονιμωτάτη) of mothers, for whom the four rivers recounted in Gen 2,6–7 are the breasts which nourish the plants.⁶⁹ Elsewhere, in a fragment preserved by Eusebius of Emesa, he suggests that this source is like the 'river gushing forth of water' (πότιμον ὕδωρ ἀνομβροῦσα).⁷⁰ Ambrose developed Philo's allegory in a Christian direction with reference to Christ the Logos as 'source' in John 4,10.⁷¹ Yet Chrysostom's addressing of Philo's ideas is entirely negative. It is likely that Chrysostom learned his polemical response, which mischaracterizes Philo, from the Genesis commentary of Eusebius of Emesa.

67 For translation as 'source' or 'fountain', a metaphorical origin of something, see Lust-Eynikel-Hauspie, *Lexicon*, ad loc.; Harl, *La Genèse*, 100. But it was also equated with 'well' (φρέαρ) in Genesis and other Septuagint and New Testament texts; see Alexandre, *Le commencement*, 231.

68 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 12.2 (PG 53,100).

69 Philo, *Opif.* 131 (PAO 1.45,13); cf. *Fug.* 178–183 (PAO 3.149,14–150,5).

70 Philo, *Q. Gen.* 1.3 (OPA 33.42–43). Πᾶν ἀμβροῦσα is a possible reading here as elsewhere in Philo's works, but this is not attested in the Armenian version of the *Questions on Genesis*. Further in this fragment 'moistening' (νοτίζεσθαι) is also used to explain the 'source'. Petit notes that the *catenae* directly accessed Philo's *Questions* only from 1.55 onwards.

71 Ambrose, *De Par.* 1.1.3 (CSEL 32/1.267,3–7), where the river of Gen 2,10 planted in paradise flows with a profusion of spiritual irrigation and so is also concerned with the 'free Jerusalem' (*Hierusalem libera*); see further Alexandre, *Le commencement*, 232. Theodoret, *Q. Gen.* 22,6–10 (LEC 1.58) discusses the problem in similar terminology. Earlier, Theophilus, *Ad Aut.* 2.19 (GRANT, 57) had supposed this potential contradiction, which he frames as a ζήτημα, to be unsolvable.

The Emesene reports the view stemming from ‘a certain Hebrew’ (Ἑβραῖος δὲ τις / ἑβραϊκῇ νῦν) that this ‘source’ took place ‘either from humidity or from divine providence’ (εἴτε δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς νοτίδος ἐγίνετο εἴτε θεοῦ οἰκονομουμένου).⁷² This dichotomy between ‘humidity’ (addressed with the common term) and providence is the problem witnessed in Chrysostom. We have, then, a case where Antiochene authors transmitted Philo’s terminology in a corresponding polemical discussion against his allegory. Placed next to Chrysostom’s positive use of Origen, and what we have learned from his broader awareness of Eusebius’ *Commentary on Genesis*, this illustrates a resourceful exegete.

2.3 Allegory

The preceding case brings us to consider further points at which Chrysostom engages Alexandrian allegory. There is another instance in which he does so through the lens of polemical reception. Chrysostom knows that regarding the location of the paradise garden, described in the biblical text as planted ‘in the east’ (Gen 2,8), some purport ‘certain mythologies’ (μυθολογίας τινας). Likening this reading to the acts of ‘dreaming’ (ὀνειροπολεῖν) and of ‘phantasizing’ (φαντάζεσθαι), Chrysostom reports that these allegorists proposed that ‘paradise is not on earth, but in heaven’ (μὴ εἶναι ἐν τῇ γῇ τὸν παράδεισον, ἀλλ’ ἐν οὐρανῷ). In this conception, ‘rivers would not even be rivers, water not really water, but something else entirely [ἕτερόν τι]’. Scripture, which ‘interprets itself’ (ἑαυτὴν ἐρμηνευούσης), shows clearly that this paradise has a physical location on earth.⁷³ The fact that Chrysostom does not penetrate meaningfully into the content of the allegorical reading is an indication that he derived his discussion from the circulation of a reactionary polemical formulation. Indeed, Guinot has shown that precisely this biblical text was the site of several authors rejecting what they viewed as Origen’s exposition of the pre-existence of souls and the resurrection, and we may add that precisely these issues are what Theodore raises in his *Against the Allegorists* where he makes the axiomatic claim, just as Chrysostom in the passage above, that allegories introduce meanings ‘other’ and foreign to the passage.⁷⁴

72 Eusebius of Emesa *apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad 2,6* (GCS NF 22.96,42) / *Cat.* 194,1 (TEG 1.135) / *Comm. Gen.* 12c (TEG 15.46). Procopius and the *catenae* attach to Eusebius of Emesa’s fragment the Philo fragment quoted in n. 70 above, but this fragment is not attested in the Armenian version of Eusebius’s commentary. See further ter Haar Romeny, *A Syrian*, 189.

73 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 13.3–4 (PG 53.108–110).

74 Guinot, *L’école exégétique*, 1159–1162, esp. 1161, where Antiochenes were ‘obliged’ to address these points. But compare Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 372 for further discussion of Antiochene responses to allegorical reading, noting that one could even charge

Take for example the report of this same polemical tradition by Epiphanius, which Jacobs described as ‘a chain of dominoes: if one [real component] falls, the rest must fall as well, and salvation itself is lost.’⁷⁵ This fourth-century heresiologist reports that ‘many’, Origen among them, ‘allegorize concerning paradise’ (πολλοὶ καὶ περὶ παραδείσου ἀλληγοροῦσιν). We note the technical use of ‘concerning /about’ (περὶ) seen elsewhere in Chrysostom, Eusebius of Caesarea, and other Antiochenes. Like Chrysostom, Epiphanius also frames the allegory of this text as ‘a fantasy’ (φαντασίαν), the result being, in Epiphanius’s representation of Origen’s words, ‘paradise is not on the earth.’⁷⁶ Yet, consistent with Theodore, as Jacobs points out, Epiphanius’s focus in the ensuing discussion is less about the particular biblical exegetical strategy involved and more about the implications of Origen’s doctrine of the resurrection for Epiphanius’s priority of proving the unity of God and the duality of man’s nature. Other authors witness the same reception. Several generations prior to Chrysostom, Eustathius of Antioch addresses himself to those who ‘allegorize’ (ἀλληγορῆσαι) as if ‘from myths’ (ἀπὸ τῶν μύθων) the notion that ‘the trees of paradise were not perceptible in a physical place.’⁷⁷ This text has been situated as a reaction to Origen’s exegesis of a possible case of resurrection in 1 Samuel.⁷⁸ A generation following Chrysostom, Theodoret repeated the problem with the same formulation found in Chrysostom: ‘some say that paradise is in heaven’ (τινὲς ἐν οὐρανῷ φασὶ τὸν παράδεισον εἶναι).⁷⁹ Origen’s actual position on the matter

aspects of Theodore and Titus of Bostra as claiming that paradise was in heaven. Another ‘obligation’, according to Guinot, was to address the tunics of skin in Gen 3,22–24, which was part of Origen’s evidence that the body was a result of the fall, a point admirably explored in Origen’s works by Jacobsen, ‘Gen 1–3’. For Antiochene reactions to this ‘tunics of skin’ interpretation, see Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 21 (TEG 15,70); Diodore, *Coisl.* 118 (CCSG 15,120), where those saying that these tunics are ‘the flesh’ (τὴν σάρκα) ‘suppose [so] evilly’ (κακῶς νοοῦντες); but he affirms that it is instead ‘the immortality of the nature’ (τὸ θνητὸν τῆς φύσεως). See Theodore, *Tr. c. all.* 3,9–20 (CSCO 189,8–9).

- 75 A. Jacobs, ‘Epiphanius of Salamis and the Antiquarian’s Bible’, *JCS* 21.3 (2013), 442–443.
- 76 Epiphanius, *Anc.* 54.2 (GCS 25,63,10–13): οὐκ ἔστι παράδεισος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; cf. Epiphanius *apud* Jerome, *Ep.* 51.5.4 (CSEL 54,404,7–9): ‘all the trees [are] transferred from earth to sky, which is written in Genesis by allegorical interpretation’ (*de terra ad caelestia transferentem et omens arbores, quae scribuntur in Genesi, allegorice intellegentem*).
- 77 Eustathius of Antioch, *Engast.* 21 (CCSG 51,42–43): οὐκ ἐνι αἰσθητὰ ξύλα ἐν τῷ τόπῳ. The problem precedes Origen. See Theophilius, *Ad Aut.* 2.24 (GRANT, 66): σαφῶς διδάσκει ἡμᾶς ἡ γραφὴ τὸν παράδεισον ὑπὸ τοῦτον τὸν οὐρανόν.
- 78 Eustathius dwelt at length on the problem of Origen’s *literal* reading of Old Testament texts as testimony of the resurrection, see the introductory studies in R.A. Greer–M.M. Mitchell, *The ‘Belly-Myther’ of Endor. Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church*, WGRW 16 (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2007).
- 79 Theodoret, *Q. Gen.* 25 (LEC 1.61).

is difficult to ascertain, as he likely changed his mind depending on literary context, but it is highly unlikely that he simply denied that the paradise trees described in Genesis were actual trees.⁸⁰ Chrysostom, then, envisages not a text but a polemical reaction to Origen's ideas witnessed by Epiphanius, Eustathius, and Theodoret.

Combined with the previous case regarding the 'source' of the rivers, Chrysostom's rejection of allegory in the *Homilies on Genesis*, of which these are the only two cases, results not from engagement with the texts of Alexandrian authors, but from common polemical traditions stemming from these Alexandrian authors and ciphered through their detractors. Taken in tandem with previous cases in this chapter such as the strong ones concerning narrative contradiction and moral propriety (see above), Chrysostom's application to the polemical tradition raises the question whether Origen's works were already, by the fourth-century, redacted for their envisioned appropriateness. To put the matter in the form of a question, if Chrysostom and others around the Antiochene group had access in some form to Origen's 'literal' explanations of the pericope of Noah's sons, then why does it seem that they did not possess his explanations of more contentious episodes?

3 Anthropological and Philosophical Argumentation

Several of Chrysostom's explanations of biblical texts with anthropological and philosophical implications indicate points at which Chrysostom found that Alexandrian non-literal interpretations were properly warranted, for he deploys them with relative precision. Several of these cases continue to advance the impression that a literary source that included Alexandrian texts,

80 M. Bockmuehl, 'Locating Paradise', in M. Bockmuehl–G.G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 204–205 and M. Alexandre, 'Entre ciel et terre: les premiers débats sur le site du Paradis (Gen. 2, 8–15 et ses réceptions)' in F. Jouan–B. Deforge (eds.), *Peuples et pays mythiques. Actes du v^e Colloque du Centre de Recherches Mythologiques de l'Université de Paris x (Chantilly, 18–20 septembre 1986)* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1988), 202–203 have shown that while his view was easily misconstrued, at least according to the Latin formulation he affirmed that paradise is situated somewhere on earth: Origen, *De prin.* 2.11.6 (BEHR, 11:278,159–160): 'it is positioned in another place on earth, which Sacred Scripture calls "paradise" (*in loco aliquo in terra posito, quem paradisum dicit scriptura diuina*). For the allegorizing of paradise, see *ibid.*, 4.3.1 (*ibid.*, 518,243–250), where he explains why he chooses a 'tropological reading concerning these points' (περὶ τοῦ αὐτὰ τροπικῶς), one 'not corporeally' (οὐ σωματικῶς) understood.

perhaps in a scholia-like fashion, was available to Chrysostom. Some of Chrysostom's witness to these ideas continues in the vein of polemical tradition, however.

3.1 *Anthropological Argumentation*

'Some ignorant people' (τινες τῶν ἀγνωμόνων), Chrysostom says in *Homily 13 on Genesis*, think that 'the soul derives from the substance of God's being' (ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐσίας ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ).⁸¹ This problem arises in the face of Gen 2,7 and Lev 17,11. The former depicts God making man from the dust and animating the form by 'breathing' into it. In the latter text, we get the axiomatic statement that the 'soul of all flesh is its blood' (ψυχὴ πάσης σαρκὸς τὸ αἷμα ἐστὶν). Chrysostom states firmly that this does not apply to human beings: 'the soul of a human being is the blood? Do not say this'.⁸² These two ideas, that the soul is from the substance of God and that the soul of a human being is the blood, likely derive from Philo's exegesis. His *Questions on Genesis* contains the relevant discussion. In coming across Gen 2,7, Philo cites Lev 17,11. To make sense of these texts, he distinguishes between the 'perceptible' (αἰσθητικῆς) and 'rational' (λογικοῦ) faculties of the soul.⁸³ The former 'substance of the soul is blood' (ψυχῆς οὐσία αἷμα), supported by Lev 17,11; the latter is 'the substance of the divine spirit' (τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα οὐσία), supported by Gen 2,7. Chrysostom thereby knew the terms which Philo used to discuss these ideas. But it is likely that Chrysostom received them through a polemical tradition. We get this impression from the fact that in their exegesis of Gen 2,7, Clement, Diodore, Theodoret, and Augustine use similar formulations to deny the idea that the soul and the divine breath are ontologically identical. Theodoret and Augustine do so with the exact formulation found in Chrysostom.⁸⁴ While *prima facie* a Manichaean doctrine, it is

81 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 13.2 (PG 53.106).

82 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 27.5 (PG 53.246): Τί οὖν; ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ αἷμα τυγχάνει; Οὐ τοῦτο λέγει. He goes on to say that the bible shares common human speech habits of speaking metaphorically about blood. So, when someone says, 'I hold your blood in my hands', Greek speakers know what he really means: I have the power of life and death over you (FOC 82.173) (ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι τινὶ, τὸ αἷμά σου βασιτάζω ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ μου, ἀντὶ τοῦ, τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἔχω τῆς ἀναίρεσέως σου). Chrysostom knows that this 'blood' in the biblical text cannot mean soul. Soul itself is an evasive concept in the bible, and in Mt 10,28, Jesus affirms that it is immaterial—for there are those who can kill body but not soul.

83 Philo, *Q. Gen.* 2.59 (OPA 33.114). Alexandre, *Le commencement*, 241–242 already suggests that Philo and Chrysostom witness to the same literal reading of Lev 17,11 and Gen 2,7. B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952), 9–11 discusses how Origen offered an allegorical solution to this problem in his *Dialogue with Heraclides*.

84 See Clement, *Paed.* 1.6.39 (GCS 12.113,15): 'Yet some dare to say that the nature of the soul ...'

likely that Chrysostom envisages a problematic exegetical opinion stemming from an Alexandrian author, since he cites the same Gen 2,7 / Lev 17,11 connection to present his discussion. His recognition of the problem includes Philo's formulations and biblical prooftexts but does not indicate meaningful engagement with Philo's explanation.

Yet other cases suggest a positive appropriation of anthropological ideas held by Alexandrian authors. First, consider Chrysostom's discussion of the striking divine pronouncement that 'My spirit is not to remain with these human beings, since they are flesh' (Gen 6,3). It is a 'habit' (ἔθος) of scripture to call 'flesh' those who are 'fleshly' (σαρκικούς), says Chrysostom. His support for this is Gen 6,3 and Rom 8,9, where Paul distinguishes between carnal and spiritual people.⁸⁵ Those who live in this fleshly state, then, lose the true title of human being.⁸⁶ Origen and Didymus made similar discussions. In the first place, both Origen and Didymus connect Gen 6,3 and Rom 8,9 in discussion of the dilemma between fleshly and spiritual modes of living.⁸⁷ Further, in one place Origen suggests in brief that the sinner as such makes his spirit become flesh, paralleling the same radical position taken by Chrysostom.⁸⁸

(δὴ τινες οὐσίαν εἶπεν ψυχῆς τετολμήκασιν); Diodore, *Coisl.* 83 (CCSG 15,86,2–4): 'the infused breath has become soul' (τὸ ἐμφύσημα γέγονε ψυχή); Theodore, *Q. Gen.* 23 (LEC 1,58): 'The soul is from the actual nature of God' (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας ἄρα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχή). Augustine, *Civ.* 13,24,5 (CSEL 40,655–660); *De Gen. ad litt.* 7,2 (CSEL 28/3/2,201,25–26): 'the being of the soul is from the very substance of God' (*esse animam de ipsa substantia dei*). In these texts Augustine is dealing with Manichaean positions. It seems that this inspired Chase, Chrysostom, 43–44 to assume that in *Homily 13 on Genesis* Chrysostom deals similarly with Manichaean opinions. It is notable that in 400 C.E. this idea is condemned at the council of Toledo, envisaging the Priscillans; see *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 201 (DENZINGER, 76). Perhaps this accounts for the recurrence of the same formulation in Chrysostom, Theodore, and Augustine. Boulnois, 'Le soufflé', 22–23 contextualizes Manichaean and Priscillian opinions further by reference to other Christian exegetes. Concerning Diodore, his opposing exegesis takes Gen 2,7 to mean that God's breath became a living soul. The source of Chrysostom appears to be different than Diodore, for Chrysostom is concerned with the idea of making the soul directly from the substance of God. D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Greek Patristic Views of Human Nature* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968), 44 discusses further early Christian theologians dealing with the ideas that the spirit of God became the soul of man, or that that soul of man was equal to blood. Compare Origen, *De prin.* 1.3,6 (BEHR, I:76,143–146), where the text of Gen 2,7 signifies that 'in all human beings is given the intelligent way of being, which is to say that all humans have participation in God' (*in omnes homines datum esse intellegitur, omnes homines habent participium dei*).

85 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 22,3 (PG 53,190).

86 See Chapter 4, and discussion in Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 169–170.

87 Origen, *C. Rom.* 1.21 (AGLB 10,88,40–52); Didymus, *In Gen.* 153 (SC 244,26); Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, 101–103.

88 Origen, *Hom. in Ps. LXXVII* 6,2 (GCS NF 19,429,2–3): 'I say in this expression that the righ-

A second case emerges in his *Homily 8 on Genesis* from addressing some 'heretics' (αἱρετικοὶ) who spoke of the divine in 'anthropomorphic' (ἀνθρωπομορφον) fashion.⁸⁹ More specifically, these heretics ascribe to the divine some 'forms and parts' (σχήματα καὶ μέλη) or 'the image of form' (τὴν τῆς μορφῆς εἰκόνα). Chrysostom's response is to cite 1 Cor 11,7 and Gen 3,16, which for him proves that only men possess 'the ruling function' (ὑπὸ τὴν ἐξουσίαν). It is this which explains the content of the man made in the form of God.⁹⁰ The sense in which 'image' must be understood, in a word, is that of 'reason of ruling' (ἀρχῆς λόγον). Costache suggests that this discussion is a reference to the historical events of the so-called Anthropomorphite controversy during Chrysostom's tenure in Constantinople.⁹¹ Yet it is not necessary to assume this. Chrysostom's comments likely arose from an exegetical tradition witnessed in Origen, a fact which is all the more remarkable as Costache points out that the controversy contemporary to Chrysostom concerned aspects of Origen's anthropology. Yet, for Origen, a certain Melito wrote a word about God's embodiment (περὶ τοῦ ἐνσώματος),⁹² by which parts (μέλη) and the form of God (μορφὴν) may be discerned.⁹³ Origen denies, further, that God has been metamorphosized (μεμορφωμένος), and denies too that the 'form of body' (σώματος μορφὴ) represents divinity. Instead, it is the ruling function, by which the beasts are subject to his authority (ὑπὸ τὴν ἐξουσίαν), the same formula used by Chrysostom. While

teous man is entirely a spirit, while the sinful man becomes entirely flesh, his soul has become flesh' (ἔλεγον ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ὅλος ἐστὶν πνεῦμα, ὁ ἀμαρτωλὸς ὅλος γίνεται σὰρξ, ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ γίνεται σὰρξ); Tloka, *Griechische Christen*, 31–34 for Origen's use of generic anthropological concepts within his wider pedagogical framework of the return of souls to their maker.

89 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 8.3 (PG 53.72).

90 Harrison, 'Women and the Image of God', 208–209; 211. In denying that women are made in the image of God, Chrysostom explains this text in the manner of Diodore. Men alone possessed this image, Antiochene exegetes found. Here Harrison discerns a common reaction against Origen. On the one hand, he affirmed that angels shared the image, so the restriction to men contradicts this.

91 Costache, 'Revisiting', 623–624.

92 Origen, *Coisl.* 73.4–5 (CCSG 15.73). This is almost certainly Melito of Sardis, who, according to Eusebius of Caesarea, *Hist. eccl.* 4.26.2 (GCS 9/1.382,7) wrote a treatise Περὶ ἐνσώματος θεοῦ.

93 D.L. Paulsen, 'Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnesses', *HTR* 83.2 (1990), 108–110 contextualizes Origen's doctrine of God as *asōmatos* in his works, especially *On First Principles*, and argues that Origen admits that the scriptures are slightly unclear on this topic. For Origen, though, anthropomorphic language must be taken in a sense befitting to an incorporeal God. Being made in the 'Image of God' does not mean that the form of the body contains the image of God, as we see here in the fragment from the *Collectio Coisliniana*.

Chrysostom has been situated in relation to his contemporary Antiochenes regarding this discussion, it is noteworthy that Origen's formulations correspond directly.

A related issue occurs in *Homily 9 on Genesis* which continues this impression. There, Chrysostom expands upon the question of the control of animals, which Origen discussed in relation to the formula ὑπὸ τὴν ἐξουσίαν. For Origen, from their disobedience, humans lost this subjugation power. Chrysostom represents it by saying 'The Greeks rise up [ἐπιφύονται Ἕλληνες] here, speaking to us'.⁹⁴ In the bible's conception, they say, man's rule is not 'that over the wild animals' (τὴν κατὰ τῶν θηρίων). Chrysostom demonstrates that, in fact, the bible does teach that men rule over wild animals, as proven by Adam naming the beasts (Gen 2,23). Yet Origen was ambivalent on this question. The bible is 'silent' (σεσιώπηται) on the matter of whether man rules over certain animals. In fact, in some cases such as 'great sea monsters' and 'the beasts [τὰ θηρία] of the earth', it is clear that these animals did 'not come into being for the sake of man' (οὐ μέντοι γε διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον). He thereby has no dominion over these.⁹⁵ Other fourth-century exegetes around John Chrysostom knew some of these ideas,⁹⁶ but the fragmentary nature of the evidence makes it impossible to specify a precise exegetical source. However, on the abovementioned philological grounds, Origen's handling of the Gen 1,26–28 impacted Chrysostom's treatment of the subject in his own context. Like the case of Noah's sons, though less strongly, it recalls the possibility that aspects of Origen's *Scholia on Genesis* were incorporated into resources available to Antiochenes. However, since we know that the *Scholia* started from Gen 5,1 onwards (not to mention the length of this excerpt), here Chrysostom's language appears indebted in some form to Origen's *Commentary on Genesis*.

Chrysostom's direct treatment of the 'breathing' (Gen 2,7) of God into the dust form of man is also dependent on Alexandrian resources. In this text, one detail indicates an anthropomorphic element: God took dust in his 'hands' in order to fashion this form. While many patristic authors took this chance to

94 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 9.4 (PG 53.78–79).

95 Origen, *Coisl.* 73,68–76 (CCSG 15.75).

96 Didymus, *In Gen.* 56–57 (SC 233.142–144) reproduces much of Origen's exegesis on this point but explains the problem of form as envisioning God as a 'composite' (σύνθετον) of soul and body. This term is not in Chrysostom. For Diodore, *Coisl.* 70 (CCSG 15.67), the ruling capacity is 'according to authority, according to the capacity of power' (κατὰ τὸ ἀρχικόν, κατὰ τὸ ἐξουσιαστικόν), formulations slightly different than those of Origen and Chrysostom. In the Armenian version of his *Commentary on Genesis*, Eusebius of Emesa does not discuss in depth the problems seen here.

reflect on the nature of the Holy Spirit,⁹⁷ in his work *Against Celsus*, Origen found precisely these creative ‘hands’ mentioned in Ps 118,73, and from this text correspondence deduced that these mentions of ‘hands’ are instances of the bible’s ‘figurative’ (τροπικῶς) language.⁹⁸ Athanasius used this same correspondence. Citing both Gen 2,7 and Ps 118,73, he states that being made with the hands of God is a ‘certain degree of eminence for the first-made man’ (πλέον τις τῷ πρωτοπλάστῳ). It is accorded ‘not by nature’ (μὴ τῇ φύσει). On the contrary, it is accorded ‘by honor’ (ἐν τιμῇ); it is by this principle alone that he is ‘made worthy’ (κατηξιώσθαι).⁹⁹ Chrysostom explains these biblical texts in the same way. He cites both Gen 2,7 and Ps 118,73 in a discussion of the bible’s anthropomorphic expressions. Being made with the ‘hands’ (Ps 118,73) of God does not accord man ‘a certain eminence by nature’ (ὥστε μὴ πλέον τι τῆς φύσεως), but by ‘honor’ (τιμῇ).¹⁰⁰ This particular discussion does not appear to be in Origen’s known work, even though he seems to have invented the citation nexus of the Genesis and Psalm texts. Chrysostom is aware of the development to this tradition witnessed in Athanasius. No surviving text from Antiochene authors contemporary with and prior to Chrysostom appear to have made this intertextual connection, and his sharing of the same formulaic expressions as Athanasius indicates either a literary adaptation, the sharing of specific resources for explaining this dimension of anthropology, or the text of Athanasius’s work being incorporated into a similar *scholia*-like resource, perhaps somehow combined with the resource above hypothesized regarding the presence of Origen’s explanations from his own *Scholia on Genesis*.

3.2 *Philosophical Argumentation*

Texts which illuminated discussions of anthropology touched upon philosophical matters, such as the nature of the soul. Another notable case of shared philosophical discussion occurs regarding the question of cosmic matter, raised by the language of Gen 1,2. In this text, the earth is described as ‘invisible

97 Boulnois, ‘Le souffle’, 6–35 has shown that Irenaeus influentially drew Gen 2,7 together with Jn 20,22 and 1 Cor 15,45 to demonstrate that the ‘breathing’ mentioned in Gen 2,7 was the Holy Spirit.

98 Origen, *C. Cels.* 4.37 (SVC 54.251,22). As Origen himself notes, the Psalm text is interchangeable with Job 10,8. For discussion of this textual connection throughout Origen’s work and its reception in later authors, see the useful outline in Harl, *La chaîne*, 11:647–652. The tradition is witnessed in *Catena Pal. ad Ps. ad* 118,73a (sc 189,304), where the author discusses Origen’s distinction between ‘His hands made’ (αἱ χεῖρες ἐποίησαν) versus ‘fashioned’ (ἔπλασαν) as concerning the soul and body, respectively.

99 Athanasius, *De Dec.* 9.1–2 (AW 2/1.8,15–18).

100 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 13.1 (PG 53,106).

and without shape'. This recalled for some the possibility of a formless matter from which all things derive their common substance. A logical problem arises, though, regarding the connection of this matter with the creator who is presumed to exist apart from it, both temporally and physically speaking. Early Christian authors concerned with the absolute unity of the divine persons brought up this idea in polemical contexts. Using straw-men arguments directed at their contemporaries, the attribution of eternal existence to fundamental matter was made to be a 'Stoic' or 'Manichaean' position.¹⁰¹ More meaningful engagements than simple *ad hominem* occur in writers like Basil of Caesarea, where Stoic theories of physical substances are integrated into his addressing Eunomius's theory of names.¹⁰² Chrysostom knows a 'controversy' (φιλονεικία) concerning this problem,¹⁰³ and we have already seen how he shared lexical resources with Basil of Caesarea to address it (above, Chapter 4.1). For Chrysostom, the only alternative to eternal matter is that the creator brought all things into existence 'from non-existence' (οὐκ ὄντων). We are not surprised to find this generic affirmation coming from Chrysostom. However, a closer look at the proofs he offers indicates use of a common argumentative tradition stemming from Alexandrian sources. It is based around the notion that the problem concerned speculation beyond the limits of human capac-

101 Hippolytus, *Ref. haer.* 10.6.4 (PTS 25.381) attributes this position to the Stoics: 'The Stoics associate the creation of all things from a measureless and single body; the beginning of all things is according to them the material without quality [ἄποιος ὕλη]'; contextualization in Nautin, 'De Justin à Origène', 89–91. For Manichaeans, see Augustine, *C. ep. fund.* 15.25.9–11 (CSEL 25.212) and discussion in B. Bennet, 'Iuxta unum latus erat terra tenebrarum: The Division of Primordial Space in Anti-Manichaean Writers' Descriptions of the Manichaean Cosmogony', in P. Mirecki–J. BeDuhn (eds.), *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, NHMS 50 (Leiden: Brill 2001), 70–77; resembling Hippolytus' discussion above, Didymus, *In Gen.* 167.19–20 (SC 244.60): 'It is not necessary to suppose according to the Manichaeans that the matter without quality [ἡ ἄποιος ὕλη] is included in the revolving "corruption of the earth"'. Köckert, *Kosmologie*, 253–289 contextualizes Origen's understanding of matter in relation to the question of its causal beginning in time. Citing Col 1.15–Jn 1.1–3, Origen excludes a temporal understanding of Gen 1.1, for instance in *In Gen. hom.* 1.1 (GCS NF 17.1.10): 'This "beginning" is not said, therefore, in some temporal way [*temporale aliquod*]'. See May, *Schöpfung aus dem Nichts* for further discussion of the Gnostic context from which early Christian expositions of this idea emerge. M. Niehoff, 'Creatio ex Nihilo Theology in Genesis Rabbah in Light of Christian Exegesis', *HTR* 99.1 (2006), 37–64 shows that Amoraic rabbinic sources respond to Christian developments in this exegetical tradition, at times affirming their text-referent strategies, and yet at others emending these traditions in polemical contexts.

102 J. Zachhuber, 'Stoic Substance, non-existent Matter? Some Passages in Basil of Caesarea Reconsidered', *StPatr* 41 (2006), 425–431.

103 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 2.4 (PG 53.30–31).

ity. His first step is to assert that one can barely tell 'how [πῶς] fleshly nature became [ἐγένετο] from the earth'. Second, he goes on, if this is the case, then surely one is in no position to say that 'from one underlying material [ὑποκειμένης ὕλης]' comes 'the different qualities [ποιότητες] which beings possess?' Third, he applies his questioning again to natural processes which appear more familiar. 'How' (πῶς), indeed, 'does one form metabolize [μεταβάλλεται] into different juices and biles' in our digestive processes?

These elements are found in Alexandrian authors. First, Eusebius reports Dionysius of Alexandria refuting the Epicurean doctrine that fatalism, the determination of substances, was the result of the distribution of underlying atoms throughout all matter. But 'how' (πῶς), Dionysius asks, did the skin and bones of human beings 'coalesce' (συνεπάγησαν)?¹⁰⁴ As in Chrysostom, the question of 'how' a human being is formed proves enough to rebut the pagan position about underlying substances. Similarly, in Basil's *Homily 1 on the Six Days of Creation*, he deems that one should 'not to meddle [πολυπραγμονεῖν] into the nature of the earth', for its origin is unknown; the alternative, then, is that by the creator's power, it comes from nothing.

The second element of Chrysostom's exposition, that concerning the underlying matter and qualities, is witnessed in Origen and others. Origen recognized that Gen 1,2 was used by some as the basis for the position that all physical forms come from 'unformed matter' (*informem materiam*),¹⁰⁵ which he aligns with the Epicurean position of indivisible atoms.¹⁰⁶ As part of his rejection of this idea, he admits that bodily substances may pass from 'one quality [*qualitatem*] into all others' from underlying matter. As he puts it elsewhere, 'the same matter which underlies [ὕλη ὑποκειμένη] all bodies is strictly speaking without qualities [ἄποιος] and shape'.¹⁰⁷ Similarly, Basil held that an 'underlying substance' (τὸ ὑποκείμενον), a 'certain nature void of qualities' (τινα φύσιν ἔρημον

104 Dionysius *apud* Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praep. Ev.* 14.26.2 (GCS 43/2.331,15).

105 Origen, *De prin.* 4.4.6 (BEHR, II:573,164).

106 Crouzel-Simonetti, *Traité*, SC 269.259, argue that Origen's text is a *modus vivendi* between the seemingly exclusive claims of *creatio ex nihilo* and the Greek doctrine of eternal matter. Stoic philosophers developed their position on material principles from pre-Socratic conceptions of atomic elements. In Origen's mind, this was tantamount to positing a corporeal deity. See Origen, *C. Cels.* 6.71 (SVC 54.448), where he names the Stoics as those who speak about 'bodily principles' (ἀρχὰς σωματικές). See G. Lettieri, *Dies una*. L'allegoria di «coelum et terra in Principio» ricapitolazione del sistema mistico-speculativo di Origene', *Adamantius* 23 (2017), 45–84 for detailed analysis of his exegesis of Gen 1,1–2 across Origen's *œuvre*.

107 Origen, *C. Cels.* 4.56 (SVC 54.273; CHADWICK, 230).

ποιότητων) precedes all matter, but that further speculation on this was impossible.¹⁰⁸ Third, to make his own case, Origen uses the examples of trees, fruit, and the digestive system, the same examples cited by Chrysostom.¹⁰⁹ Chrysostom thereby used, albeit in a cursory fashion, a philosophical explanatory tradition known by Origen. We can tell this is a cursory engagement because, like his mention of the allegorical interpretation of the paradise narrative, Chrysostom expressly denies the existence of the underlying substrate, which on the contrary Basil and Origen affirm. Chrysostom's use of the same terminology, basic argumentative strategy, and applications of these to biblical texts, however, is notable for our purposes of establishing a textual resource that incorporated or derived from Alexandrian resources.

4 Typology

Previously it was shown that Antiochenes like Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa were reticent about typology in the text of Genesis, in contrast to Eusebius of Caesarea and John Chrysostom who developed several notable cases in the same way (see especially Chapters 4.3 and 7.1). We have followed Breck's reading in viewing Antiochene typology as concerned with the shape of biblical events, the *historia*, in order to justify and qualify the assertion of messianic referents.¹¹⁰ More generally, Young explains typology in patristic exegesis as grounded by a sense of recapitulation, the impress of one narrative symbol or outline onto another, fulfilling it and giving it meaning.¹¹¹ The question is *how* and *why* authors justified their understanding of such recapitulative impresses. Antiochenes often understood them by looking specifically at the shape of *historia* in the narrative, whereas Alexandrians looked towards linguistic con-

108 Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 1.8 (GCS NF 2.15). At one point, Origen, *De prin.* 4.4.7 (BEHR, II:574,182) says that the demarcation of underlying substances from their external qualities 'is discerned in understanding alone' (*intellectu solo discernitur hoc*). We find a similar idea expressed in Gregory of Nyssa, *Opif.* 24 (PG 44.212d): 'The form of each quality is not separated from the thing underlying it by word; rather, the word is a kind of intellection, and not bodily envisioned' (ἀλλὰ μὴ ἕκαστον ποιότητος εἶδος λόγῳ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου χωρίζεται. Ὁ δὲ λόγος νοητὴ τίς ἐστι, καὶ οὐχὶ σωματικὴ θεωρία). Alexandre, 'L'exégèse', 179 notes that 'la représentation commune de la matière informe constitue un point de départ plus traditionnel, plus aisé, que la conception rare d'une matière formée par le seul concours des qualités'. She is referring here to Gregory's development of Origen's idea; Blowers, *Drama*, 180.

109 Origen, *De prin.* 4.4.6 (BEHR, II:573,164).

110 Breck, 'Theōria antiochienne', 55.

111 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 152.

nections between texts. In the *Homilies on Genesis*, John Chrysostom holds the two together firmly, and draws on previous models of text-referent webs shared with Alexandrians to give him the lead in doing so.

4.1 *The Rational Lamb (Aqedah)*

Take for example the case of the typology of the ram suspended in the bush during the binding of Isaac. In this episode, Abraham proved willing to sacrifice his only-begotten son, an expression also found in Rom 8,32. This correspondence thereby encouraged an obvious typology in relation to Christ's death on the cross. But details such as Isaac's 'binding' were difficult to fit into a theological framework, thus creating a degree of caution in regard to how precisely the events could be viewed as recapitulative of or impressing upon one another.¹¹²

Various traditions, therefore, developed regarding how to establish correspondences between Gen 22 and the crucifixion. Chrysostom focuses on the 'ram' (χρίδς) stuck in the bushes (22,13). The divine messenger instructs Abraham to use this animal as the sacrifice instead of his son, Isaac. For John Chrysostom, from this vantage point is a 'type' (τύπος) or 'shadow' (σκία) of the 'cross' (σταυρός) or the 'truth' (ἀλήθεια).¹¹³ 'Here is one only-begotten' (μονογενῆς ἐκεῖ); 'there, is another only-begotten' (μονογενῆς ἐνταῦθα). Here, there is 'ram' (χρίδς); 'there, the reasonable lamb' (ἀμνὸς οὖτος ὁ λογικὸς) which was 'brought forth' (προσεφέρετο) for the sake of the whole world.

In his commentaries on Genesis and John, Origen draws together these peculiar elements. First, we know that he read the Gen 22 narrative as 'a type'.¹¹⁴ Second, in the *Commentary on John*, he proposes the 'rational lamb' theme that comes to the fore in Chrysostom. The key text for Origen is John 1,29. There, John the Baptist announces Jesus as the 'lamb' (ἀμνὸς) who has come to take away the sins of the world. The prologue to the gospel of John implies that this same Jesus is the 'reason' (λόγος). Origen picks up on this connection and relates the image

112 Harl, 'La *ligature* d' Isaac', 67–69. As early as Melito, *Frag.* 9 (HALL, 74,2–11), Rom 8,32 and Isa 53,7 are used to understand the sacrifice of Christ. The Isaiah text imagines the victim as a 'sheep' (πρόβατον) or 'lamb' (ἀμνὸς) lead to the slaughtering block. For Melito this is 'likened to' (ὡς) the 'ram given' (χρίδς ἐδόθη) in sacrifice (Gen 22,13).

113 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 47.3 (PG 54.432); the same language is used in *In prod. Jud.* 2.4 (PG 49.388), where the plague of death striking the Egyptians in the book of Exodus is viewed 'a type of the spiritual' (τύπος τοῦ πνευματικοῦ). It signifies 'how great is the kinship' between 'lamb and lamb, unreasoning vs. reasoning' (ἀμνὸς καὶ ἀμνὸς, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἄλογος, ὁ δὲ λογικός).

114 Origen, *Cat.* 1252 (TEG 3.219) 'Just as Christ raised his cross, this was a type of that' (ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐβάσταξεν αὐτοῦ τὸν σταυρόν· τύπος γάρ ἦν τοῦτο ἐκείνου).

of the lamb to the sacrifices of animals ‘brought forth’ (προσφερομένων).¹¹⁵ He thereby uses the same word as found in Chrysostom to express the action of making sacrifice. Further, in Origen the sacrifice of this lamb is of ‘perpetuity’ (ἐνδελεχισμού) because this lamb is spoken ‘symbolically the reason-lamb’ (λόγος ἀμνός συμβολικῶς). Because of this, his sacrifice pertains ‘to the illumination of the soul’ (τῷ φωτίζεσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν) and ‘to the mind’ (τῷ λογικῷ νοητῇ).¹¹⁶ Chrysostom was not alone in following Origen in this exposition. Gregory of Nyssa,¹¹⁷ Theodore,¹¹⁸ and Theodoret¹¹⁹ all witness the description of Christ as the rational lamb, but Chrysostom appears unique in his application of this theme to the typology of the binding of Isaac. Diodore and Eusebius of Emesa go in different directions with their exegesis of Gen 22, focusing on their knowledge of the Hebrew translation of the location Sabek as ‘remission’,¹²⁰ aspects which do not appear in Chrysostom. Apparently, Origen’s ‘reasonable lamb’ tradition was used regularly by some Antiochene authors, and Chrysostom applies it to the famous typology of the binding of Isaac. While there are notable parallels between the two authors on philological grounds, the evidence for the theme’s widespread currency suggests that Chrysostom did not inherit this idea directly from Origen’s work. But the fact that he uses an established tradition

115 Origen, *In Jo.* 6.51.264 (GCS 10.160,6); cf. *Comm. Mt. Frag.* 53 (GCS 41/1.36), where John 1,29 is read in the text of John the Baptist presenting repentance and the ‘remission of sins’ (Mt 3,14). Klostermann suggests that Chrysostom is reliant in detail on Origen in his corresponding commentary *ad Mt* 3,14.

116 Origen, *In Jo.* 6.52.269–270 (GCS 10.161,12–13).

117 Gregory of Nyssa, *De deitate Filii*, GNO 10/2.115–144; Harl, ‘La *ligature* d’Isaac’, 68.

118 Theodore, *Frag. Jo.* 111 (ST 141.377,4–6), he links the paschal feast of the Jews to the passion of Christ. In the feast ‘by the Jews’ there is ‘a lamb’ (παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις προβάτου); ‘instead of’ (ἀντὶ τοῦ), by Christ, ‘for the sins of the whole world a rational lamb is brought out’ (λογικὸν ἀμνὸν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου προσάγων ἁμαρτίας).

119 Theodoret, *Interp. ep. ad Heb.* 12,22–23 (PG 82.777): ‘There is an ancient covenant, here a new one; there is the slaven mediator, here the Son; There the blood of unreasoning creatures, here the blood of the rational Lamb’ (ἐκεῖ διαθήκη παλαιά, ἐνταῦθα καινὴ· ἐκεῖ δοῦλος μεσίτης, ἐνταῦθα Υἱός· ἐκεῖ αἷμα ἀλόγων, ἐνταῦθα αἷμα Ἀμνοῦ λογικοῦ). Mention of the ‘blood of Abel’ causes Theodoret to deploy the same ‘here and there’ rhetoric as Chrysostom and invoke the ‘blood of the reasonable lamb’ as the ‘better’ foundation of the New Covenant.

120 Diodore, *Coisl.* 204 (CCSG 15.200–2001): ‘But it is supposed by the Hebrews that this “Sabek” signifies remission, and this would be clearly [taken as] the mystery of the cross ... since Isaac is even a type of [Christ’s] passion’ (τοῖς δὲ Ἑβραίοις δοκεῖ τὸ σαβέκ «ἄφεσιν» σημαίνειν καὶ τοῦτο δὲ τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ σταυροῦ δηλωτικὸν ἂν εἴη ... ἐπεὶ καὶ τύπος τοῦ πάθους αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰσαάκ); Eusebius of Emesa, *Comm. Gen.* 78 (TEG 15.130), emphasizes the place where the son of God would be crucified. An outline of the impact and imaginative developments of this tradition in Syrian authors is in Brock, ‘Genesis 22’, 7–8; see Ephrem, *Comm. Gen.* 20.3,1–2, in which the lamb hung on the tree is also born from the earth, and this ‘hanging’ depicts the day when he died who tasted death for the sins of the world.

in his explanation of the typology indicates a degree of learning and discerning application of complex ideas that suit his purposes. It is notable, further, that this particular image was grounded on the intertextuality of John 1 and Gen 22.

4.2 *Japheth and the Church*

We have already seen how Chrysostom witnessed aspects of Origen's commentary on Noah and his sons, but it was unclear at which points Chrysostom's knowledge of this commentary begins and ends. Like Origen, Chrysostom dealt with the questions of a seemingly redundant addition concerning Canaan's parentage and the moral propriety of Cham's curse. A third shared aspect emerges in regard to Noah's other sons, Japheth and Sem. The biblical text says that Japheth's tents will 'enlarge', and for him Canaan will be a slave (Gen 9,27). As at other points in the narrative, this word 'enlarge' also 'has a hidden treasure', Chrysostom says.¹²¹ It 'hints at' (αἰνίττεσθαι) the relationship between 'two peoples' (τῶν δύο λαῶν): from Sem, the Jews; from Japheth, the 'calling of the Gentiles' (τῶν ἐθνῶν κλήσιν). While no comments survive regarding this typology from Origen's *scholia* or commentary on Genesis, the same construction occurs in the *Homilies on Joshua*. Japheth typifies the 'form of a people' (*formam populi*), more specifically 'salvation [arising] from the Gentiles' (*salvatur ex gentibus*). Sem, on the other hand, typifies the old 'way' (*formam*), 'which was saved by circumcision' (*qui ex circumcisione salvantur*).¹²² While the basic idea that Sem and Japheth prefigured aspects of Christian and Jewish identity is found in earlier authors such as Irenaeus and Justin Martyr,¹²³ Chrysostom's specific application to the Jews and the calling of the gentiles is a typology also employed by Origen, and they explained it with similar terminology.

¹²¹ John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 29.7 (PG 53,271).

¹²² Origen, *Hom. Jesu nave* 3.4 (GCS 30.306,2–5).

¹²³ Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 3.5.3 (SC 34.127,21–22), but he merely states that Christ will unite the circumcised and uncircumcised, established by Japheth and Sem; Origen also has this idea. We get closer to Chrysostom's formulation in Justin, *Dial.* 139.4 (PAR 47/1.556): 'There are two [peoples], therefore, "being blessed" from the peoples' (δύο οὖν λαῶν εὐλογηθέντων), but he understands it as the servitude of Canaan and the inheritance of freedom in Christ. Neither of these authors, therefore, provide Chrysostom's specifications, which is supported by the surveys of Harl, *La Genèse*, 143–145; C.T.R. Hayward, *Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis*, OPCS (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 138; Anonym. *Cat.* 788, 859 (TEG 2.177; 214). For the rabbinic tradition that Sem is the ancestor of the elect people and Japheth is the father of the Greeks, see M. Simon, *Verus Israël. Étude sur les relations entre chrétiens et juifs dans l'Empire romain* (135–425), BEFAR 166 (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1948), 38.

5 *Testimonia* Collections

Common resources between Alexandrian authors and Chrysostom may be explored from the angle of Testimony Collections, also known as *testimonia*. These works were essential tools by which patristic exegetes searched for intertextuality, which as Young identified, reinforced pneumatic and mimetic awareness of how the bible could clarify itself and be assimilated to the horizon of the reader.¹²⁴ As a provisional definition, Testimony Collections can be regarded as collections of Old Testament (and for Christians, New) texts used to present a supporting or elaborative series of proofs for a thesis.¹²⁵ There is firm evidence that these were in use during the patristic period,¹²⁶ and several scholars have suggested that their use may be discerned in the work of John Chrysostom. There are few detailed case studies to support this asser-

¹²⁴ Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 85; 95–99; 133.

¹²⁵ I paraphrase here the definition in S. Morlet, 'Eusebius and the *Testimonia*: Tradition and Originality', in A.-C. Jacobsen–J. Ulrich (eds.), *Three Greek Apologists: Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2007), 96: the *testimonia* 'are biblical proof-texts, drawn essentially from the Old Testament which attested, for the early Christians, that the prophets and Scripture as a whole had predicted Christ, the rejection of Israel, the call of the nations, and the replacement of the Law by the Gospel'. The most important study on the subject remains that of Albl, '*Scripture Cannot be Broken*', where on p. 65 he has distinguished Extract Collections from Testimony Collections, and on the following pages offered seven criteria for determining their use in a given author (investigated below). While Extract Collections are 'general collections of excerpted materials' (Albl, *Pseudo-Gregory*, xiii), the latter more specifically concern an argumentative thesis. While Morlet is correct to focus his definition on the proving of messianic fulfillment, most often in the figure of Jesus, or a polemical stance towards religious groups, most often Christians towards Jews, Albl has drawn attention to their wide subject matter, such as the soul and moral concerns, which is further substantiated in the present section of this chapter. Among earlier 20th-century research, that of Harris, *Testimonies*, is typically signaled as fundamental, the construction and reception of which is discussed in the helpful study of A. Falcetta, 'The Testimony Research of James Rendel Harris', *NovT* 45.3 (2003), 280–299. For second- and third-century Christian use of *testimonia* resources, see O. Skarsaune, 'The Development of Scriptural Interpretation in the Second and Third Centuries—except Clement and Origen', in M. Sæbø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament*, 373–442 and J. Daniélou, *Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne (Les Testimonia)*, ThHist (Paris: Beauchesne, 1966).

¹²⁶ Albl, '*Scripture Cannot Be Broken*', 97–157 and the useful survey in Morlet, 'Eusebius and the *Testimonia*', 95–99 on extant works known to have been composed in the genre. In this article, Morlet concludes that, from the vantage point of the *Demonstration on the Gospel*, often considered as a model of patristic use of *testimonia*, Eusebius's text bears little relation to known *testimonia* of the time. He was, therefore, innovative. This conclusion is important for our considerations, as it witnesses to the complex shifting of traditions and tools in the fourth-century when Chrysostom worked. Along with this, though, we note

tion, leaving as a *desideratum* a systematic exploration.¹²⁷ It has been suggested that he used them in some of his polemics against the Jews and was aware of one in his exegesis of Romans, in the latter case possibly referencing the tool directly.¹²⁸

In Table 9 below I offer six cases that demonstrate that Chrysostom used a Testimony Collection in his *Homilies on Genesis*, and that in some cases his resources were shared by Alexandrian authors. The six cases may be grouped according to thematic headings, laid out in column 1. In Column 2, I provide the biblical texts cited by Chrysostom and an Alexandrian author, mostly Origen. In Columns 3 and 4, I give noteworthy 'variant' readings of these biblical texts as found in these authors. In most cases, the readings concern variants from the established text of the Göttingen editions or differences between Chrysostom and the relevant Alexandrian author. The significance of the words given in Columns 3 and 4 pertain to the discussion of *testimonia* criteria which follows the table, for instance, a sign of a *testimonium* is that the authors' biblical text citations vary from established texts. In the final column, 'Explanations', I provide terminology which Chrysostom and Alexandrian authors use to explain their understanding of the significance of the *testimonium*. I underline parallel words to advance the likelihood of common sources shared between the two authors.

There are three noteworthy aspects from Table 9: confirmations of Testimony Collections, Chrysostom's explanations in relation with Alexandrian authors, and his explanations in relation with Antiochene authors.

that precisely this work, the *Demonstration on the Gospel*, was used by John Chrysostom's *Quod Christus* and *Homily 67 on Genesis* (see Chapter 7).

127 Two exceptions: M. Scopello, 'Les «Testimonia» dans le traité de «L' exégèse de l' âme» (Nag Hammadi, 11,6)', *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 191.2 (1977), 165 grouping Chrysostom with Philo, Origen, and Didymus in his use of Ps 45,11–12 and Gen 12,1 as an explanation of the return of the soul to the 'House of the Father'; p. 169 grouping Chrysostom with Tertullian and Theodoret in his use of Ezk 33,11 and Isa 1,18 as an explanation of repentance and divine philanthropy. Even Albl, '*Scripture Cannot Be Broken*', 25–26 includes Chrysostom in his panorama of patristic authors without any firm evidence. His citation of Simon, *Verus Israel*, 174–177 provides no data regarding this question, but only further general assertions about the impact of anti-Jewish *testimonia* on Christian authors who wrote in the *Contra Iudaeos* genre.

128 For exegesis of Romans, see Harris, *Testimonies*, 11:139. The relevant text is John Chrysostom, *In ep. ad Rom. hom.* 18 (EP 1.311c): 'it says this being taken well from a witness' (εὐχαίρως τῆς μαρτυρίας ἐπιλαβόμενός φησιν). But this 'witness' (μαρτυρία) may not be a *testimonium* collection *per se*; Chrysostom may be referring to Paul's own argumentative plan of citing the prophets as proof.

TABLE 9 *Testimonia* shared between *Homilies on Genesis* and Alexandrian works

Topic	Biblical texts	Chrysostom's readings	Alexandrian readings	Explanations
1. Repentance and Salvation ¹²⁹	1 Tm 2,4 Ezk 18,23 Jer 7,18 Jer 15,19	Wishing / men θέλων / ανθρώπους I wish / of the sinner θέλω / τοῦ ἀμαρτωλοῦ By the army of heaven τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	He wishes / men vult / homines He wishes / of the sinner vult / peccatoris Queen of the heaven reginae coeli	Chrysostom: Truth / virtue / leading by the hand ἀλήθεια / ἀρετή / χειραγωγών Origen: Restoration ἀποκατάστασις
2. Humility ¹³⁰	Mt 5,5 Ps 131,1 Nm 12,3 Mt 11,29	Of all meekness πάσης τῆς πραότητος Meekness of all human beings πραότατος πάντων ἀνθρώπων	Of all meekness πάσης τῆς πραότητος Meek among all human beings Πρᾶος παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους	Chrysostom: Fairness / having tranquility of soul / stillness / anger ἐπιείκεια / ἀτάραχον ἔχειν τὴν ψυχὴν / ἡσυχία / ὀργῆς Origen: stillness / lack of anger / tranquility of soul ἡσυχίτης / ἀοργησίας / ψυχῆς ἀτάραχος
3. Human Passions ¹³¹	Jer 5,8 Ps 139,4 Ps 58,4 Lk 13,32	Horses ἵπποι Of snakes ἀσπίδων of a senseless snake ἀσπίδος κωφῆς	Horses ἵπποι A snake ἀσπίς A fox ἀλώπηξ	Chrysostom: Habit / horse / snake / deaf adder ἔθος / λαγνεῖαν / δολερόν / ἀποφράττοντας Origen: Habit / horse / fox / snake ἡθῆ / ἀκολασία / πανουργία / θανατηφόραν
4. Generational Sin ¹³²	Jer 38,30 Ezk 18,20 Dt 24,16	Children τέκνα	Sons / each one υἱοί / ἕκαστος	Chrysostom: Everywhere / each one πανταχοῦ / ἕκαστος Origen: Better βέλτιον

129 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 3.4 (PG 53.37); 44.2 (ibid., 408); Origen, *Hom. Jer.* 14.18 (SC 238.108); *Hom. Ex.* 8.6 (GCS 29.232–233).

130 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 35.1 (PG 53.313); Origen, *Comm. Mt. Fr.* 81 (GCS 41/1.48).

131 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 23.4 (PG 53.202); Origen, *Comm. Mt. fr.* 137.2 (GCS 41/1.68–69); cf. *Hom. Ez.* 3.8 (GCS 33.356); *Cant.* 3 (ibid., 211).

132 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 29.6 (PG 53.269); Origen, *C. Cels.* 8.40 (SVC 54.554,12).

TABLE 9 *Testimonia* shared between *Homilies on Genesis* and Alexandrian works (*cont.*)

Topic	Biblical texts	Chrysostom's readings	Alexandrian readings	Explanations
5. Confession ¹³³	Prv 18,17 Isa 43,26 Ps 31,5	Condemns himself ἐαυτοῦ κατήγορος First / you shall be justified πρώτος / δικαιωθῆς	First condemns himself ipsi nostri accusatores prior / You shall be justified iustificeris I will describe ἐξαγορεύσω	Chrysostom: Confession / he brings out ὁμολογία / ἐξαγορεύει Origen: Of the bringing-out / to be carried in front of the whole / the devil truly preventing ἐξαγορεύσεως / publicari cuncta proferri / praeventus enim diabolus
6. Light ¹³⁴	Gen 1,3–5 John 1,9 Rom 13,13			Chrysostom: The perceptible light / the intelligible light / error / truth τὸ φῶς αἰσθητόν / τὸ φῶς νοητόν / πλάνη / ἀληθειαν Didymus: Concerning the perceptible light / ignorance of darkness περὶ αἰσθητοῦ φωτός / ἄγνοια σκότος

5.1 *Confirmations of Testimony Collections*

Albl outlined seven criteria based on the pioneering work of Harris for identifying the presence of a Testimony Collection in a given text.¹³⁵ Aspects of these are present in texts of Chrysostom and Origen above, and taking note of them clarifies the relationship of Chrysostom to Alexandrian sources in regard to testimony collections.

¹³³ John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 20.2 (PG 53.168). Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 3.4 (GCS 29.308,5–23); Origen *apud* Procopius, *Ecl. Lev.* (*Monac. graec.* 358, GCS 29.308).

¹³⁴ John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 3.2–3 (PG 53.34–35); Didymus, *In Gen.* 6–8 (SC 233.44–48).

¹³⁵ Albl, *And Scripture Cannot be Broken*, 66; Pseudo-Gregory, XIV–XV: (1) quotations that deviate considerably from known scriptural texts; (2) composite quotations; (3) false attributions; (4) use of the same series of texts in independent authors; (5) editorial or interpretative comments indicative of a collection; (6) evident lack of awareness of the biblical context of a quotation; (7) use of the same exegetical comments in independent authors; cf. Harris, *Testimonies*, 1:8.

- (1) *Variant Biblical Quotations.* Several cases of this occur in Table 9 above. In his citation of Ezk 18,23, Chrysostom's text changes the established 'I shall wish' into 'He wishes', and 'the lawless one' (ὁ ἄνομος) into 'a sinner' (this may be due to composite citation, see below).¹³⁶ Both of these changes are witnessed also in Origen's text (*vult; peccatoris*). These changes have the effect of focusing on the subject matter of the *testimonium*, namely repentance from sin. Similarly, the established 'meek' (πραῦς) in Nm 12,3 is changed into the 'meekness' (πράοτατος) which fits the biblical citations around it. Whereas the established text reads 'Exceedingly meek among all human beings' (πραῦς σφόδρα παρὰ πάντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους),¹³⁷ that of Chrysostom reads 'Meekness of all humans' (πράοτατος πάντων ἀνθρώπων). Another minor change occurs in the citation of Jer 38,29–30, where Chrysostom's text reads 'children' (τέκνα), whereas Origen's agrees with the established 'sons' (υἱοί).¹³⁸
- (2) *Composite citations.*¹³⁹ We see composite citations in the case of Jer 38,30, which closely resembles Dt 24,16 and Ezk 18,20. These texts mention in some form that the sinner is the one who bears his own death penalty, not sons for their fathers or vice versa. Chrysostom places the phrase 'This same one shall be killed' (αὐτὴ καὶ ἀποθανεῖται) within his Ezekiel citation. But this formula occurs in Jeremiah, making it a composite citation.
- (3) *False Attributions.* Chrysostom understands Lamech's confession of sin as a 'fulfilling [πληρῶν] what the prophet says', but he goes on to quote Prov 18,17, which is frequently referred to as 'Proverbs' or the supposed author Solomon, or the more generic epithet of 'wise man'.
- (4) *Same Text-Series.* Column 1 confirms the use of the same series of texts in independent authors. This point may be expanded by noting that several of the Collections catalogued in Table 9 occur in other early Christian authors, and multiple times in Chrysostom's own work. Some, such as the collections on Generational Sin and Confession, are extensively witnessed.¹⁴⁰

136 VTG 16/1.167; both readings are variants.

137 VTG 3/1.170; this is also a variant in Theodoret.

138 VTG 15.362; not recorded as a variant.

139 For background in Judaism and early Christianity, see the essays in S.A. Adams–S.M. Ehorn (eds.), *Composite Citations in Antiquity. Volume One: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015). In their introduction, Adams–Ehorn, *Composite Citations*, 3–4 define this phenomenon as the fusing together of two or more texts, with a citation marker by the author. This is, therefore, distinct from citations which are strung together with conjunctions such as καί.

140 Generational Sin: Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 2.15.2 (CCSL 1.492,18–20); Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.*

- (5) Interpretative Comments. There are some indications from Chrysostom that he relies on a source for collecting his references. One case emerges when he suggests that 'everywhere is found [πολλαχού ἔστιν εὑρεῖν] in the prophets what is said here'. This 'everywhere found' gestures towards a global perspective afforded by a Collection.¹⁴¹ He then cites his texts with a series of conjoining 'and ... and again' (καὶ ... καὶ πάλιν), indicating that he is working with a list. Further, in the case of the Testimony Collection on Confession, for Chrysostom there is an insight from 'the depth' (τὸ βάθος) in the Genesis text.¹⁴² 'Let us seek it out' (διερευνησώμεθα), for here 'a treasure is concealed in these brief phrases', but what follows is his citation and elaboration of Prov 18,17 and Isa 43,26. Similarly, in his use of the Collection on the Passions, Origen suggests that a 'lettered soul will find out' (φιλόκαλος εὐρήσει) Scriptural proofs to furnish how the beatitude at hand (Mt 5,5) envisions the movements of the passions of the soul.
- (6) Lack of Context. Chrysostom clearly does not know the context of many of his quotations. Consider Isa 43,26 and Jer 5,8 for demonstrating Confession and Human Passion, respectively. In context, these metaphorical images clearly pertain to Israel's situation, and thereby appear rather forced in application to the subject matter of Chrysostom's expositions.

Based on these first six criteria, Chrysostom and Origen are relying on similar but not uniform Testimony Collections. The strongest similarity is their common scriptural citations. There are notable disagreements, such as one author providing texts not witnessed in the other, or citation forms that differ. These subtleties indicate different developments of traditions rooted in similar sources. The fifth criterion, the use of the same exegetical comments in independent authors, supports this picture.

5.2 *Alexandrian and Antiochene Explanations*

The seventh criterion of a *testimonium* adopted by Albl is the presence of common exegetical comments found in independent authors. This does not suggest that they used the exact same source or that there is a formal relation between

223,5 (COURTONE III:15); Acacius, *Frag. Ex.* 20,3–4 (ST 201.119,1–8); Ambrosiaster, *QVNT* 14.3 (CSEL 50.40). Confession: Eusebius of Caesarea, *Comm. Isa.* 2.25 (ZIEGLER, 282); Didymus, *Comm. Ps.* 270,34 (PTA 6.200); Hilary, *Tract. Ps.* 125,10 (CSEL 22.611); John Chrysostom, *Adv. Iud.* 8 (PG 48.931); Ambrosiaster, *QVNT* 30 (CSEL 50.57–58); Ambrose, *Ap. David* 9.47–10.55 (CSEL 32/2.330–336); *Cain* 2.7.24 (CSEL 32/1.399); *Paen.* 2.7.53 (CSEL 73.185); *Exp. Ps.* 37.11–13 (CSEL 64.144–145); *Ex. Ps.* CXVIII, 2.14 (CSEL 62.27–28).

141 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 29.6 (PG 53.296).

142 John Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 20.2 (PG 53.168).

the two authors. At times, though, there is specificity in Chrysostom's formulations in regard to those found in Origen.

Thus, on the collection regarding humility, Chrysostom and Origen use the same Stoic moral terminology. The soul who possesses the virtue of humility is 'undisturbed' (ἀτάραχος), upheld by 'calmness' (ἡσυχία), and avoids 'anger' (ὀργή). In this they share also with Basil a similar discussion around the same citations.¹⁴³ But this diverges with what is witnessed in Antiochenes. Like Chrysostom and Origen, Theodore studied the word 'meek' (πραύς) with a tool. Based on his *Commentary on the Psalms*, his definition of 'meek' is one whose posture relates to 'the things unmoving' (τὰ ἀκίνητον) and 'leisure' (ἀργόν). Theodore shared this with other ancient sources, both Aristotelian commentators and Christians.¹⁴⁴

More vividly illustrating a distinction among Antiochene and Alexandrian approaches to testimony collections is the case of the collection on 'light'. There, in the face of Gen 1,3–5, the creation of light, Chrysostom cites John 1,9 where Jesus says that he is the true light of the world. Chrysostom uses this opportunity for a rare moment of moral allegory familiar to Alexandrian authors, where 'the perceptible light' (τὸ φῶς αἰσθητὸν) pertains to the darkness of 'error' (πλάνη), and 'the intelligible light' (τὸ φῶς νοητὸν) pertains to the truth of Christ's teaching. Rom 13,13 is cited to support the imagery of Christian life in the light of the 'day'. These same moves are found in Didymus, the Alexandrian master contemporary to Chrysostom. For him, Gen 1,3–5, John 1,9, and Rom 13,12–13 suggest that there is a distinction 'concerning the perceptible light' (περὶ αἰσθητοῦ φωτός), which is really the 'ignorant darkness' (ἄγνοια σκότος), in contradistinction to the light which is the teaching of Christ. We note another occurrence of the use of the term 'about / concerning' to denote the non-literal referent or *skopos* of a biblical text. Further comparison with other patristic exegetical traditions on this nexus shows that Chrysostom was working with Alexandrian traditions specifically.

In his comment on Gen 1,3 preserved in the *Collectio Coisliniana*, Diodore rejects explicitly the opinion maintained by Chrysostom. Some heretics, says Chrysostom's mentor, hold that the 'light' and the 'darkness' of Gen 1,3–5 correspond to an 'intelligible' (νοητὸν) sort, meaning the Son of God and the devil.¹⁴⁵

143 Basil of Caesarea, *Hom. Ps.* 33,2 (PG 29,356) has the same biblical citations around Mt 5,5, and to explain the opposite state to meekness, says it is 'never to have disorder inhabiting these same souls' (μηδεμίαν ἔχειν παραχῇν ἐνοικοῦσαν αὐτῶν ταῖς ψυχαῖς).

144 Schaublin, *Untersuchungen*, 104.

145 Diodore, *Coisl.* 28,6–15 (CCSG 15,28–29); cf. Procopius, *Ecl. Gen. ad 1,2* (GCS NF 22,16–17,79–84). A similar but less developed metaphor is found in Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 2.8 (GCS NF 2,33–34).

The compiler of the *Collectio* understands this as the ‘opinion of Origen’ (Ὁριγένους δόξαν), but we have already seen it developed in Didymus. Chrysostom does not explain the ‘darkness’ as the devil, as Diodore’s source appears to have done. Thus, against the countenance of his predecessor in Antioch, Chrysostom was willing to deploy with reserve what he found to be a warranted allegorical reading based on a Testimony Collection tradition shared with Alexandrian authors. There are philological reasons for supposing dependence on this source, as he produces the explanatory terminology found in Didymus and witnessed also in Diodore.

Finally, Chrysostom encourages his hearers to ‘confession’ (ὁμολογία) by the word ‘he brings it out’ (ἐξαγορεύει). While Chrysostom does not cite Ps 31,5, this term appears there. For his part, Origen does cite Ps 31,5 in conjunction with Prov 18,17 and Isa 43,26, the two texts found in Chrysostom. For Origen, this term becomes a key explanatory principle of the act of confessing one’s sins. A similar pattern occurs again when Chrysostom cites Dt 24,16–Jer 38,30 in short form. In the full context of these quotations, the biblical texts specify that ‘each’ (ἕκαστος) one is responsible for their own sin. The mention of ‘each’ does not occur in Chrysostom’s biblical quotations, but they are in Origen’s. However, Chrysostom mentions several times in his exposition that each (ἕκαστος) one is responsible for his own sin. Between Origen and Chrysostom there is also a similarity in technical terminology used to discuss a Collection. On the passions, both Chrysostom and Origen say that it is a ‘habit’ (ἥθος / ἔθος) of scripture to liken passions to animals. We note further that Didymus, too, calls the metaphorical attribution of passions to animals a ‘habit’ (ἥθος) of biblical anthropology.¹⁴⁶

6 Conclusion

This chapter has extended a line of inquiry already forged by studies such as Guillet and Ondrey. That Alexandrian and Antiochene authors shared a general framework of text-referent exegetical tradition has been identified, but the precise contours of this network of interpretive webs is difficult to reconstruct. Here we have contributed to this task from the perspective of John Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Genesis*. The data surveyed calls for the positing of a resource by which parts of Origen’s *Scholia on Genesis* was available to Antiochenes. Several cases of precise linguistic correspondence between Chrysostom’s and

146 Didymus, *In Gen.* 70,8–15 (SC 233.174); cf. Ambrose, *Exp. Ps. CXVIII*, 10.11 (CSEL 62.210).

Origen's work just mentioned, set over against that of Eusebius of Emesa's, call for such a hypothesis. The strongest example for this is the treatment of the pericope of Noah's sons, where Chrysostom and Origen use the same formulas to articulate the same exegetical questions, such as why the 'addition' of Canaan's name to the already enumerated three sons, a question entirely absent from Eusebius of Emesa's (and what is known of Diodore's) commentary. Another aspect about this particular collection is noteworthy, namely that both Origen and Chrysostom introduce their discussions through the language of questions-and-answers, especially the *zētēma*.

However, this strong case is more an exception to the rule. Most of the cases in this chapter did not exhibit such precise linguistic parallels, but they are characterized by precision of intertextual strategies. How the bible interpreted itself—which biblical texts could be used to illuminate one another based on linguistic combination and parallel—is the most important shared intellectual resource between Chrysostom and the Alexandrians. Amirav's study had already demonstrated this at the micro level of three homilies, showing that different accents were made in the interpretative process on the basis of common citation couplets. Using a much wider field (and, consequently, a shallow rhetorical analysis), this chapter has carried forward that insight and shown more about the nature of their shared resources, providing us with crucial information about how Chrysostom evaluated non-literal readings.

One feature is that particular texts could elicit specific non-literal image parallels, captured in as little as a single word. This is slightly different than the traditions of glossing that ancient exegetes shared. Both Chrysostom and Didymus knew that the 'altar' erected by Abram (Gen 12,7) could be understood as an image of 'thanksgiving', a word that does not occur in the Genesis text but was common to Pauline literature. Chrysostom, independently of Didymus who viewed this 'thanksgiving' from the perspective of virtue-ethics, explained 'thanksgiving' with reference to 1 Tim 2,8, wherein is mentioned the practice of hands-raised prayer. Because Didymus did not cite 1 Tim 2,8, but rather other New Testament texts, it seems that Chrysostom thereby produced his own sense of 'thanksgiving' within an exegetical context which conveyed the awareness of multiple possibilities within this text-web. Chrysostom's non-literal reading, then, was brought up through his knowledge of exegetical tradition. In this case, as in *Rezeptionsgeschichte*, Chrysostom's intertextuality revises a previous text-referent model by transposing it into his own liturgical context and underplaying the element emphasized by Didymus regarding the constitution of Christian prayer by the Spirit (cf. Chapter 5.5.2). The *historia* of the image and context of an ancient altar is invested with a eucharistic meaning, a meaning which Eusebius of Emesa denied explicitly.

Related to this, Chrysostom shared with Alexandrians many cases of established intertextuality, where couplets and explanatory formulas traveled together and were favored resources for discussing larger ethical and theological issues. These contribute strongly to the hypothesis of further shared resources such as that mentioned above, for their precision and cumulative weight indicates a scholastic exchange. Again, Didymus is a valuable witness here, but the parallels were not found to be strong enough to suggest that he is Chrysostom's source. For instance, both Chrysostom and Didymus know to cite a rare variant of Job 3,23 when explaining Noah's onomastic interpretation. This variant provides irresistible material for an allegorical interpretation. 'Death is rest for a man', that 'rest' being the same word used in the rare onomastic tradition for Noah's name. Such a connection invokes Noah into the grand-narrative of creation, fall, and curse. Thus, Chrysostom's resources enabled him to discover intertextual connections. As in the case above, strictly speaking, 'rest' does not belong to the Genesis text but rather the scholastic resource, and it is with the word provided in this resource that the parallel biblical text of Job 3,23 is adduced. Chrysostom breaks the rule, as it were, of Antiochene exegesis, providing connections to the text at hand that do not emerge on immediate contextual or factual ('historical') grounds; yet it is precisely through linguistic study that the connection is forged. The scholastic resource is both his warrant and guide to articulating non-literal interpretations.

The point may be made even more strongly from the perspective of the light and darkness allegory emerging from the *testimonium* collection of Gen 1,3–John 1,9–Rom 13,13. These three texts mention the word 'light', enabling a truly holistic biblical correspondence to be made. For Didymus, Gen 1,3 is spoken 'concerning the perceptible light' but may be interpreted 'according to an allegory' (κατ' ἀλληγορίαν)¹⁴⁷ about the 'intellectual light'. That is to imagine the distinction of Christian identity as children living 'in the day' of the light of the world, that is, opposed to the 'Jewish' 'darkness of ignorance'. The same allegory occurs in Chrysostom, using 'truth' and 'error' as his controlling explanation, applied more to his teaching about creation out of nothing versus subsistent matter. Diodore had denounced a version of this reading as allegorical. Chrysostom's warrant was based in his knowledge of the traditional intertextuality. This positive case stands in stark contrast to the negative mentions of allegory.

When he did reject allegory in the *Homilies on Genesis*, Chrysostom did so through the stringent filter of polemical traditions. In these few cases, such as

147 Didymus, *In Gen.* 8a,9 (SC 233,48).

the rivers or the location of paradise, he did not engage the actual interpretative strategy present in Philo and Origen whose terminology and topics were most likely involved. Specific Genesis texts became signals for problematizing theological viewpoints, especially regarding the eschatological condition and the spiritual body tied to the resurrection. But concern about these issues does not preclude engagement with other anthropological traditions and formulations shared by Alexandrians. Thus, Chrysostom witnesses a remarkably precise application of a couplet and text-referent tradition to address the anthropomorphic divine 'hands', Gen 2,7–Ps 118,73, a tradition later ascribed to Origen in the Palestinian psalter-catena but whose explanatory formulations align most closely with Athanasius. This tradition clarifies the dignity and nature of the human being in relation to God. Not witnessed in his Antiochene predecessors and contemporaries, these were fruitful for explaining the coherence of the bible's anthropological teaching.

Conclusion

John Chrysostom's interrelation of exegetical tradition and rhetorical aim may be described by what Jauss aptly called the 'symbiotic unity' between 'imitation and creativity, preservation and discovery, tradition and innovation'.¹ In the form that we have them, the *Homilies* were composed with precise reference to other models, at least sections of Eusebius of Emesa's and Diodore's *Commentary on Genesis*, Basil of Caesarea's *Letter 260*, Eusebius of Caesarea's *Demonstration on the Gospel 8.1*, his *Question 7 to Stephen*, and Origen's *Scholia on Genesis*. Systematic parallels throughout indicate that the list was likely more extensive, but lack of surviving material does not at this point permit further precision. The fact that so many of Chrysostom's exegetical choices can be paralleled to other Late Antique exegetes attests to a widespread, shared, network of exegetical traditions, 'webs' of text-referents on which Chrysostom built as he interpreted the text anew.

Joining paradigms of research that view Chrysostom's homiletic discourses as an integral art, this work has shown how previous models of exegesis functioned as both creative cache and methodological ideal for his pedagogical purposes. Disputation, which included the dialogical revision of traditional models, is always related to ethics, the implementation of behaviour envisioned by the preacher to connect biblical history with his own context. In this way, Chrysostom's handling of the bible may be understood as 'zetetic', in contrast to other knowledge-models of Late Antiquity such as Epiphanius's 'antiquarian' approach.² Whereas Epiphanius deployed biblical learning to create overwhelming, cumulative caricatures of his opponents' views, Chrysostom constructed contained engagements with previous exegetical models for the purposes of making memorable and coherent his ethical teaching. While this was not an open invitation to scholastic curiosity or democratic dialogue between different religious viewpoints, the asking and answering of questions regarding the biblical text, and the subtle adaptation of how previous models posed such questions, is essential to his idealized pastoral purposes.

As mirrored by the structure of the present work, focusing on how Chrysostom accomplishes this connection takes us to the heart of his standing in webs of patristic exegetical tradition and illuminates just how interconnected these webs were across authors of disparate ecclesial contexts and literary genres.

1 H. Jauss, 'Tradition, Innovation, and Aesthetic Experience', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 46.3 (1988), 375.

2 Jacobs, 'Epiphanius'.

Chrysostom's theoretical expression in the *Homily 5 on Isaiah 6* that non-literal reading is warranted only where the text permits is shown to be an overused and perhaps unhelpful gateway into Chrysostom's hermeneutics. As expressed systematically in practice, Chrysostom's non-literal readings are warranted through name-depth study. In line with a 'zetetic' model, themes, images, and doctrines of spiritual and canonical relevance are 'hinted at'. They are found 'hidden' under or 'murkily' veiled by the specific words, places, and names in the biblical text. Chrysostom has thereby too often been simplistically ranged next to Diodore's distinction between *theōria* and *historia* and Theodore's polemic against allegory as the importation of foreign meaning. As such, *theōria* does not occur for exegetical value in the *Homilies on Genesis*, and in the rare cases where Chrysostom brought up polemics against allegory, they concerned the controversial theological implications of the paradise narrative that circulated widely. While he shared some of their didactic emphases, techniques, and awareness of exegetical questions-and-answers, and so should be positioned in relation to Antiochenes, in practice Chrysostom's non-literal readings preferred Syro-Palestinian and Alexandrian terminology and tradition.

Holding these elements together permits a global perspective on Chrysostom's didactic priorities, from which we distinguish three.

1 Asking Exegetical Questions to Defamiliarize

'Do not be estranged', Chrysostom would say at numerous points concerning a biblical word, image, or verse. This use of the Greek root *xenos* is illustrative, for often Chrysostom would ask questions about the biblical texts in order to create gaps of understanding for his audience, what Chin has observed as the creation of an 'unstable' biblical text.³ Viewed from within the wider panorama of Late Antique Christian exegetes, especially Antiochenes Eusebius of Emesa, Diodore, and Theodore who were aware of the translated character of the Septuagint and sought to clarify it, Chrysostom's basis of operation from the fundamental supposition of the bible's linguistic instability is unsurprising. Chrysostom expressed this instability with a range of metaphors pertaining to obscurity and clarity and hidden treasure, but also with subtler cues such as 'instead of' or questions like 'what is this?' The *Homilies on Genesis* form a strong reference point for a curriculum of questions-and-answers presup-

3 Chin, *Grammar and Christianity*.

posed in many of his other Old Testament exegetical works, such as *On the Obscurity of the Old Testament*, *Sermon 9 on Genesis*, *Homilies on the Changing of Names*, *Homilies 7 and 9 on the Statues*. In this dossier, *zētēma*, *aporia*, and related terminology reflect a scholastic engagement with the book of Genesis for catechetical and pastoral purposes. Into the gaps created by these destabilizing 'questions' he could invest his own ideality of meaning, related back to the single-*skopos* or *hypothesis* of the particular discourse. Even the seemingly simple task of glossing and paraphrasing, which was widespread throughout his homilies and often guided by learned resources, is aimed to revert his audience's attention to their envisioned spiritual significance.

Covenant practices, intermarriage, a shoestrapp, basic human action-metaphors ('Their eyes were opened'), the rainbow, a refugee packing up his tent like a soldier, a brother feeling anger for his violated kinsman—all such cases could be affirmed as unfamiliar and so containing a particular teaching which Chrysostom wished to give. Many of these were less obviously problematic—who needed to think twice about the anger felt over a violated kinsman? Assessing the background to Chrysostom's word glosses illuminates that his knowledge of scholastic traditions imposes the possibility of conveying knowledge or bringing out content which can be related to the thematic coherence of the discourse. Thus, in his *Homily 29 on Genesis*, asking how Noah's sons Sem and Japheth knew not to publish abroad their father's nakedness, Chrysostom's answer is that it was by the natural law, a question related to traditional exegetical discussion about how Noah knew to make wine. But in asking the question about what would seem a rather obvious response from the perspective of moral judgement, Chrysostom defamiliarizes the scene by investing it with an anticipatory character, prefiguring the law given to Moses and so establishing a providential red-thread of Jew and Gentile throughout human history. The typology is riveted further by the looming possibility, which he poses, of contradiction and redundancy in the narrative: does the curse on Cham at one point contradict his blessing at an earlier one? Why is Canaan brought up in the first place? The questions enable him to show this providential red-thread as the *skopos* of the Noah cycle, studied here and in Amirav's work. The layering of Chrysostom's reading strategies thereby becomes complex, as a non-literal, typological interpretation of Noah's sons is correlated directly to literary-critical concerns about narrative coherence, word glossing, and the *skopos* which the *paraenesis* makes clear: the sign that the divine has not abandoned human beings is that they are responsible for their own actions, always capable of choosing to single themselves out from the crowd and take the narrow path of virtue.

Similarly, a number of cherished cultural practices, particularly those surrounding family and honour-traditions, are called into question. Speculating

about Cain's marriage connected to reflecting on the deeper significance of names such as Seth and his son Enosh, Cain's brother and nephew. Chrysostom used exegetical traditions to pose questions that would place these characters into sharp relief, their stemming from the same stock being an obvious problem that 'made foreign' the view that honour succeeded accorded to bloodline. Thus, 'What is the meaning [of Seth's name]?', follows with non-literal readings connecting Seth and his son to themes of salvation history like the transgression of Adam and the resurrection of Christ. Chrysostom suggests, then, that all along, it is mindset that has composed the true lineage of honour, and so the true divine people. This provides an important window into Chrysostom's logic for selecting non-literal readings.

By singling out a particular name or word, non-literal readings serve as material for totalized contrast within his definitions about what is true versus what is false. At several points, notably at the ends of discourses, Chrysostom explains 'true' characteristics and qualities, such as 'freedom' or 'death'. These follow upon the exegetical discussions which have defamiliarized seemingly intimate or presupposed practices. In this Stenger's analysis of text-worlds provides the helpful categories of refamiliarization and defamiliarization. Chrysostom's take on death as 'truly' sleep alone, for instance, defamiliarizes this intimate and universal experience. His teaching is that the salvific economy of Christ has effected a historical change in the meaning of 'death' in light of the resurrection, in which his audience is implied to share. Through exegesis of Gen 49–50, in which he relied on Eusebius of Caesarea's *Demonstration on the Gospel* 8.1, the 'anticipatory' character of the text heightens this point, as Joseph's mourning is not allayed even after speaking proleptically about salvation in Christ.

'True freedom' is related to the typology of Cham, Sem, and Japheth who signify, respectively, those living in slavery, the Jews, and Gentle Christians. Their names have been made to stand for familiar, long-established historical constructs. However, Chrysostom effectively dissolves his own typology by eschewing the idea that a particular race was destined to servitude. For even those in Cham's line, the Ninevites, famously fasted and repented in time for restoration. To accomplish this, Chrysostom demonstrates some revision of previous models. Coming across the name 'Nebrod', he asks, 'What does this mean, "opposed to God?"' Understood as opposed to God by the onomastic sources, Nebrod is actually aligned within the family of repentant, and so truly 'free', persons. Exegetical traditions draw out aspects of these narratives that could serve the dialectic of familiarity and distance that Chrysostom created with his audience.

2 Selecting and Modifying Exegetical Traditions for 'Symphonia'

Chrysostom consistently drew upon traditions which create concord between biblical texts, yet this is accomplished most often as a pedagogical method and seldom as a stated *skopos*. While earlier apologists developed the concept of the 'symphonia' between Christian and classical Greek culture, biblical commentators championed this notion as an internal literary phenomenon, witnessing to the stability of history presided by divine providence. As a strategy for creating overlapping cognitive 'text-worlds', it served Chrysostom's purposes. Explicit mention of the *symphonia* of Scripture, such as between Old and New Testaments or across the Old Testament itself, occurs only a few times in the *Homilies on Genesis*. Yet Chrysostom's intertextual method effectively reaches toward this ideal consistently throughout. It can work to clarify linguistic questions, such as when he juxtaposes the expression 'opening of the eyes' found across different parts of Genesis. Both occurrences of this expression, Chrysostom shows, signify the act of understanding. It was found that some of these word-use juxtapositions derived from his exegetical training. For instance, like other Antiochenes, Chrysostom cites two Genesis texts in parallel to explain the meaning of the stars being 'placed' in the sky, and these Antiochenes demonstrate remarkable consistency in clarifying what this verb 'placed' should *not* mean. Examples like the latter abound and prove the sharing of a common exegetical resource by which Theodore, Diodore, Eusebius of Emesa, and Chrysostom could give the exact same gloss on this 'placed' verb, the same parallel text, and the same explanation.

But for Chrysostom, more often, the concern for *symphonia* frames the question itself, as when he asks why Scripture 'contradicts itself' at certain points. The points he brings up under this heading are developed extensively in other writings such as Eusebius of Emesa's *Commentary on Genesis* and Origen's homilies. Often the same explanations are witnessed, such as Origen's and Chrysostom's referring to the providence over the human race in face of the problem of God resting in Gen 2,4 versus Christ saying that the Father is 'still working' in John 5,17. Chrysostom reports this as a *zētēma*, gesturing towards the shared scholastic culture of patristic biblical exegetes. Our case-study of *Homily 37 on Genesis* brings the concern for *symphonia* (one of the few places in the *Homilies on Genesis* where the term appears) to the fore in a systematic way throughout the discourse. Multiple exegetical questions address Scriptural internal contradiction, but he goes a step beyond this and synchronizes traditions of biblical study with other text-worlds, such as the juxtaposition of biblical literature as 'deep' versus pagan literature as shallow and 'broad' (the two are contradictory, then); alternatively, the providence of the creator (appeal to which solves the

potential textual contradictions) is 'contrary' to human understanding, extending his promise even through the family of a refugee. Exegetical traditions thereby undergirded his construction of a hierarchy in which the audience was expected to make value judgements, such as between pagan and Christian literature, or the practice of almsgiving versus public displays of wealth.

Considering whether Chrysostom used *testimonia* traditions extends our understanding of the pedagogical concern for *symphonia* and returns to the question of his evaluative process to legitimate non-literal readings. With Ephrem the Syrian (and to the best of our knowledge, no other available patristic work), Chrysostom shared the textual construction that made Sodom and Gomorrah into a case where the divine acts in accordance with what we know is just: he investigated the situation before announcing a verdict. The precise application of the same four biblical texts to the same pericope and the judiciary *skopos* speak towards a more experiential aspect of *symphonia*, that between bible and life. Similarly, a common citation framework of texts from Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah, witnessed across several different early Christian authors and literary genres, upholds the notion that the bible does not teach that children suffer for the sake of their parent's sins. But Chrysostom appears unique in applying this framework to harmonize with the problem of Canaan's curse. Again, the presentation of a value judgement on his father Cham as incontinent is the result. Chrysostom presents multiple 'spaces' in which the texts and their question resonate with various other moral and literary quandaries, such as the superfluous addition of names and the publication of a patriarch's mistake. Textual knowledge, aided by exegetical tradition, opens onto different levels of the same question of moral autonomy.

His innovation from within this web lies in the way he applied text-referent traditions to new problems and biblical texts. Since we were able to view the use of this *testimonium* tradition regarding generational sin in its context, Chrysostom's innovative take was only one among several other exegetical traditions at work in the same homily. He connects this tradition, for instance, with the typology of the sons of Noah and his use of Origen's *Scholia* for explaining some details regarding the wine and enumeration of family members. Concordance, then, functioned to instate Chrysostom's intended ethical teaching and confirm his non-literal interpretations with the creation of parallel images.

In this vein, he changed an obscurity about the bowing of Joseph's parents known by Diodore and Eusebius ('To whom?', they asked) to a potential contradiction regarding the efficacy of Joseph's dream—Chrysostom raised the possibility that this was unfulfilled prophecy. Precisely this notion of anticipatory speech, then, recurs throughout the homily, showing how the 'faith' spoken of in Hebrews 11 is exemplified by the bowing of Jacob's parents. It also sets up

the exposition of the Blessing of Jacob (Gen 49) for which Chrysostom used a non-Antiochene source, Eusebius of Caesarea, to create a systematic typology. This rather dense tissue of traditions shows us that Chrysostom could revise Antiochene traditions as suited his aims, and that the result enabled him to create coherence with his ensuing exploration of non-literal exegesis. Typology is often reinforced by concordance within the biblical text. So, Eusebius of Caesarea's typology of Gen 49 finds warrant for Chrysostom because 'the vine' in 49,11 may accord with John 15,1 where Christ self-identifies as 'the vine'. But other aspects of this non-literal reading, such as the 'white teeth', are not argued intertextually; they are supplied by Eusebius. In such moments, it is the tradition that determines Chrysostom's exegetical choices. So too Chrysostom adapts an allegory of 'light' developed in Didymus and Origen, which they supported with concordance between Gen 1,3, John 1,9, and Rom 13,13, the last clearly conveying the ethical import because Paul recommends his readers to walk as 'children of the light'. Whereas they viewed the 'darkness' of creation as the 'devil' or 'ignorance', Chrysostom used the same three text referents to say that this darkness is 'error', specifically the error of holding that the creation comes from pre-existent matter. He thereby used an Alexandrian allegorical tradition, based in concordance, to advance his own teaching. Diodore explicitly denounced this idea as 'allegory', just as he had the Eusebian typology of Gen 49.

3 Creating Non-literal Readings from Traditions of Name-and Word-Depth Study

In his typologies and onomastic interpretations, John Chrysostom departs from his Antiochene *milieu*. Thus, to accurately describe Chrysostom's experience of interpretation, we must account for three things. First, the fact that the name is the gateway. Second, that this knowledge is provided and warranted through tradition. Third, that Chrysostom strove to connect these meanings with other exegetical maneuvers in the context of the discourse by creating a fluid but hierarchical evaluative framework.

If Origen's method for evaluating the appropriateness of a non-literal reading included the identification of philological parallels, John Chrysostom may be said to share this methodology insofar as he was guided by previous traditions. Chrysostom discerned which ideas and words from previous traditions could be used to unite or corroborate the *skopos* of a discourse. 'A single idea', writes Rousseau about Chrysostom, 'dominates an extended address; an address nevertheless held carefully together by constant repetitions and cross-

references'.⁴ What is remarkable about this pattern in Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* is that traditions of text-referent are themselves the basis for the provision of parallels that construct non-literal meanings.

We see this especially with his use of onomastic traditions. The text-referent of Noah as 'rest' (not 'righteous') provides Chrysostom with a key word absent from the Genesis text but that can be searched out elsewhere in Scripture, leading to his identification of 'rest' in a rare variant of Job 3,23, where 'death is rest for a man'. With Didymus Chrysostom allegorizes this death to be the curse of Adam (warranted by the text: 'You shall surely die', warns God) which is labor and toil. The precision of these agreements demands a shared resource between the two authors. The same justification based on name-interpretation is found in his elaborate use of Eusebius of Ceasarea's *Question to Stephen* 7 to explain the birth of Tamar's twins in Gen 37 as a detailed typology of the historical drama of the Church—God's true people—ceding first order to the Jews. Divine favor, in fact, rested on them first but only for a 'little while'. Each interpretative move is based on *historia* of the text, such as the 'little bit' by which Zara's hand rises out of the birth canal first, only to be put back. But the initial impetus for committing to the typological reading comes from Eusebius—the onomastic tradition is not known before him, and the numerous linguistic parallels between he and Chrysostom are telling. It is Eusebius who provides Zara as meaning 'rising', and this messianic image is enough for Chrysostom to elaborate the entire interpretation in detail.

Name interpretation was not an occasional practice of adornment but could substantiate the *skopos* throughout an entire homily. Taking up the meaning of 'Nod' as 'tossing', Cain's vagabond condition, Chrysostom highlights in *Homily 19 on Genesis* the meaning of other names and their importance. It leads to a reconsideration of the purpose of naming at the fundamental cultural level. Using the framework of natural law, exegetical traditions that reveal the depth of names show that the practice of naming children belongs to an even deeper moral and historical importance. What his audience considers as an honour-practice can be cast as an opportunity to express the same gratitude as Seth, whose name is a 'memory' of Adam and Abel, and whose son Enosh's name 'invokes' the Lord; similarly, 'Enoch' is 'murkily' 'about' the resurrection. Naid, in this sequence, is negatively interpreted to show the effects of a lineage gone awry. Thus, the exegetical traditions which supply the name-referent couples inspire a hierarchical-evaluative framework.

4 Rousseau, 'Homily and Exegesis', 23.

4 Antiochene Debates about Non-literal Interpretations

At several points, John Chrysostom adopted interpretations which Diodore explicitly deemed 'allegorical', and conversely, Chrysostom rejected interpretations as 'too philosophical' that were Diodore's opinions. This calls for a revision of our understanding of Chrysostom as Diodore's pupil. Based on this research, Chrysostom should be considered as an eclectic exegete, well-trained in Antiochene works, but who made consistent effort to incorporate a broad range of resources witnessed by Syrian and Alexandrian authors.

Chapter 5 substantiated that to a considerable extent, Chrysostom was aware of questions-and-answers in the *Commentary on Genesis* by Eusebius of Emesa, and at many points, based on the surviving material, Diodore and Chrysostom go different directions from this common source. At the same time, however, a considerable collection of other cases exhibits total independence from and contradiction to Diodore and Eusebius. The most interesting point for our considerations emerges from the comparison of Diodore, Eusebius of Emesa, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Diodore on Gen 49. There, it is clear that the Emesene and Diodore know the Caesarean's readings but reject most of them, restricting Christological referents to only two verses. Chrysostom was, with the support of a known resource, willing to say more, that the whole pericope was spoken 'about Christ'.

This expression 'about' (περί) acquires a technical meaning for Greek exegetes, as they identified problematic readings by denying that they could be 'about' a subject absent from the text, such as Theodore denying that Micah 5 was 'about' Christ and Chrysostom affirming that it was, in fact, 'about' him. It was a debate about which points in the text could be validated as either the change of a *skopos* or the addition of a *skopos* in a layered reading. Chrysostom's distinction from his contemporary Antiochene authors is his willingness, in practice, to determine ecclesiological, moral, and Christological referents over an extended pericope. His non-literal readings follow directly upon texts that receive literal readings, making it seem difficult to determine the reason behind his change of the *skopos*. Chrysostom included non-literal readings at the points where he clearly has the resources to make these distinctions. Such resources provided intra-biblical connections and ethical and theological themes to incorporate into his discourse. For instance, Jacob's deathbed bowing as prophecy is related to Gen 49 as anticipatory speech, and these in turn reflect back upon Jacob's actual death scene in which his son weeps in anticipation of Christ overcoming death—of which 'we' know the benefit. This returns us to the integrality of rhetoric and exegesis. Chrysostom's non-literal readings are always adduced for their value as text-images in his task of leading souls according to what he viewed as the teachings of the Church.

Chrysostom regularly presented exegetical traditions to his audience because he believed in the reciprocal relation of knowledge and ethics. The knowledge that certain figures, characters, images of the Old Testament could be viewed in a figurative, salvation-historical dimension supported his paraenetical elements by which he sought to instill his understanding of Christian identity. By presenting his teachings as a search for treasure, he urges the reader to consider the Divine authorship of history, which is reflected and made accessible to the reader by the language of the bible, and tiny words like names and places especially could lead one to perceive this providence. By invoking the precision and economic effectiveness of previously developed ideas, Chrysostom creates a dialogical space for the reader to consider the physical objects around him as spiritual because even their names may be invested with typological significance. For Chrysostom, this connection is intelligible because it is manifest in the bible itself, especially through the prominence in the Old Testament of etiological narrative. He presupposes a continuity of the physical universe, that seen both in text and in world, as the arena in which the Creator was incarnated for the sake of showing a higher—or deeper—ethical plane on which to act. From here he can place the reader's spiritual path into evaluative relationship with that of the biblical heroes and create qualitative hierarchies spanning between both worlds. His experience as an interpreter is dictated by this need. To view Chrysostom's art in its full dimensions, his dialogical revision of previous exegetical models provides a perspective on his concerted effort to bring the developed resources of biblical science of his epoch to bear for his audience's benefit.

Occurrences of Ζήτημα and Ἀπορία in the *Homilies on Genesis*

This table accompanies primarily Chapter 3. Its aim is not to provide a full parallel apparatus to Chrysostom's 'questions', naming every text where similar questions occur, but to show that Chrysostom's 'questions' do, in fact, parallel at least one other patristic work. I was unable to find a relevant parallel to Question 22.

Case number	<i>In Gen. hom.</i> (PG; trans. FOC)	Biblical text	Chrysostom's 'Questions'	English translation (modified)	<i>Parallelia</i>
1	2.2 (PG 53.27; FOC 74.31)	1,1	<i>Ἐν ἀρχῇ ... "Ἄξιον ἐνταῦθα διαπορήσαι, τίνος ἕνεκεν ὁ μακάριος οὗτος προφήτης, μετὰ πολλὰς ὕστερον γενεάς γεγονώς, ταῦτα ἡμῖν ἐκτίθεται.</i>	<i>In the beginning ... To pose a question here: why did this blessed prophet, born many generations later, put this to us?</i>	Ambrosiaster, <i>QVNT</i> 3.11 (CSEL 50.21)
2	9.3–4 (PG 53.78; FOC 74.120–121)	Gn 1,27	<i>Ἄλλ' ἐνταῦθα ἐπιφύονται ἡμῖν Ἕλληνες λέγοντες, ὅτι οὐκ ἀληθὴς ὁ λόγος εὑρίσκεται· οὐ γὰρ ἄρχομεν τῶν θηρίων καθάπερ ὑπέσχετο, ἀλλ' αὐτὰ ἡμῶν ἄρχει ... ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ προκείμενον ζήτημα πάλιν ἐπανίωμεν.</i>	<i>Now on this matter pagans make a rejoinder to us with the claim that the truth of the sentence is not found; we do not, in fact, control the wild beasts, as was promised, but they control us ... but let us return to the question posed before.</i>	Origen, <i>Phil.</i> 14 (SC 302.406–412)
3	10.7 (PG 53.89; FOC 74.139)	Gn 2,3–Jn 5,17	<i>Τί οὖν ἐστι τὸ ἐντεῦθεν ἀνακύπτειν ἡμῖν ζήτημα; Τῆς θείας Γραφῆς ἐνταῦθα λεγούσης, ὅτι κατέπαυσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ἐν τοῖς Εὐαγγελίοις ὁ Χριστὸς φησιν, ὁ Πατὴρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται, καὶ γὰρ ἐργάζομαι. Οὐ δοκεῖ ἐκ τῆς προφορᾶς τῶν ῥημάτων ἐναντίωσιν τις εἶναι ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις;</i>	<i>What, then, is the question that arises for us at this point? While Sacred Scripture in this passage says that God rested from his works, in the Gospels Christ says, My father is at work up until now and I am at work. Does there not seem from the sequence of the expressions to be some</i>	Origen, <i>Hom. Num.</i> 23.4 (GCS 30.216); Methodius, <i>Conu.</i> 9.1 (SC 95.266); Eusebius of Caesarea, <i>Comm. Ps.</i> (PG 23.168)

(cont.)

Case number	In Gen. hom. (PG; trans. FOC)	Biblical text	Chrysostom's 'Questions'	English translation (modified)	Parallelia
				contradiction in what is said?	
4	12.1 (PG 53.99; FOC 74.158)	Gn 2,4	Ἄξιον ἐνταῦθα ζητῆσαι τίνος ἕνεκεν βίβλον αὐτὴν καλεῖ οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ γῆς, καίτοι πολλὰ ἕτερα τῆς βίβλου περιεχούσης, καὶ διδασκούσης ἡμᾶς καὶ περὶ ἐτέρων πλειόνων	It is worth enquiring at this point why it is he calls it the book of heaven and earth in view of the fact that the book contains many other things and teaches us about a greater number of other matters	Philo Q. Gen. 1.1 (OPA 33.41–42); Origen, Cat. 191 (TEG 1.133) Theodore?, Cat. 190 (TEG 1.132)
5	14.4 (PG 53.115; FOC 74.188)	Gn 2,16–17	Καὶ οἶδα μὲν, ὅτι πολυθρύλλητόν ἐστι τοῦτο τὸ περὶ τοῦ ξύλου ζήτημα, καὶ ὅτι πολλοὶ τῶν ἀπαρφυλάκτως φθειγγομένων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν τὴν αἰτίαν μετάγειν ἐπιχειροῦσι, καὶ λέγειν τολμῶσι· τίνος γὰρ ἕνεκεν ἐδίδου αὐτῷ τὴν ἐντολὴν εἰδῶς ὅτι παραβήσεται; καὶ πάλιν, διὰ τί γὰρ τὸ ξύλον προσέταξε γενέσθαι ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ; καὶ πολλὰ ἕτερα.	I am aware that this question about the tree is commonly debated, and that many people inclined to speak incautiously endeavor to shift the blame from human beings to God, presuming to ask, why on earth did he give him the instruction in the knowledge that he would infringe it? And again, Why did he order the tree to be in the garden? And many others.	Basil of Caesarea, <i>Quod deos</i> 9 (PG 31.348); Titus of Bostra, <i>C. Man.</i> 3.7 (CCSG 82.251)
6	16.2 (PG 53.127; FOC 74.209)	Gn 3,1	Ἄλλ' ἴσως ἐνταῦθα διαπορήσειεν ἄν τις, καὶ μαθεῖν ζητήσειεν, εἰ καὶ τὸ θηρίον λόγου μετεῖχεν	Perhaps some may raise a difficulty to find out if wild animals also shared power of speech.	Ambrosiaster, <i>Quaest.</i> 31 (CSEL 50.58–60); Diodore, <i>Coisl.</i> 106 (CCSG 15.108–109)
7	16.5 (PG 53.131; FOC 74.216)	Gn 3,7	Ζήτημα μέγιστον ἡμῖν ἐντέθειν τίκεται, ὅπερ πρώην ὑπεσχόμην τῇ ὑμετέρα ἀγάπῃ. Δικαίως γὰρ ἄν τις ἔροιτο, τίνα ἰσχὺν εἶχε τὸ ξύλον ἐκεῖνο, ὥστε τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ βρώσιν τοὺς	At this point a very important question arises, which I promised you, my dear people, yesterday to deal with. What I mean is that someone could rightly ask what	Acacius, <i>Coisl.</i> 108 ^{bis} (CCSG 15.112); Diodore, <i>Coisl.</i> 109 (CCSG 15.113); Theodore,

(cont.)

Case number	In Gen. hom. (PG; trans. FOC)	Biblical text	Chrysostom's 'Questions'	English translation (modified)	Parallelia
			ὀφθαλμούς αὐτῶν διανοί- ξαι	particular quality was it which that tree had that resulted in the opening of their eyes from eating it	<i>Coisl.</i> 110 (CCSG 15.115)
8	16.5 (PG 53.132; FOC 74.218)	Gn 3,7	Τὸ αὐτὸ ἂν εἴποιμεν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἐτέρου ζητήματος τοῦ ἐντεῦθεν ἀνακύπτον- τος. Φασὶ γάρ· Διὰ τί τὸ ξύλον γνωστὸν καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ καλεῖται;	We would make the same point in regard to the other question that arises at this stage. That is, they ask, Why was it called the tree of the knowledge of good and evil?	Titus, <i>C. Man.</i> 3.23 (CCSG 82.277–278); Eusebius Em., <i>Comm. Gen.</i> 20j (TEG 15.66)
9	17.9 (PG 53. 147; FOC 74.244)	2,17–3,4	Ἀλλὰ πάλιν ἡμῖν ἕτερον ζήτημα ἐντεῦθεν τίκεται ... φησὶν ὁ Θεός· Ὅτι ἂν ἡμέρᾳ φάγητε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε· δεί- κνυνται δὲ ζήσαντες μετὰ τὴν παρακοήν, καὶ τὸ τῆς βρώσεως μετασχεῖν, πολ- λῶν ἐτῶν ἀριθμὸν. Τοῦτο δοκεῖ μὲν ἀπλῶς τοῖς ἐπι- πολαίως ἐντυγχάνουσι τοῖς ἐγκειμένοις ἔχειν ζήτησιν τινα.	At this point, however, a further question arises for us ... God says, <i>On the day you eat from it you will truly die</i> , yet they are shown living for a great number of years after the disobedience and tasting the food. This seems to pose a problem for those who read the subject matter superfi- cially.	Origen, <i>Cat.</i> 475 (TEG 1.303); Euse- bius Em., <i>Comm. Gen.</i> 15d (TEG 15.50)
10	18.3 (PG 53.151; FOC 82.8)	Gn 3,22– 23	Εἰ δε τις βούλοιο περιέρ- γος ὦν ζητεῖν, διὰ τί ξύλον ζωῆς ἐκαλεῖτο, μανθανέτω μὴ πάντα μετὰ ἀκριβείας τοῖς οἰκείοις λογισμοῖς ἀκολουθοῦντα δύνασθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔργα κατοπτεύειν.	If, however, someone of a meddling nature should enquire why it was called the tree of life, let him learn that it was not possible for human beings to discern all God's works precisely by following their rea- soning.	Eusebius of Emesa, <i>Comm.</i> <i>Gen.</i> 20a–b (TEG 15.58)
11	24.6 (PG 53.213; FOC 82.117)	Gn 7,2–3	Πάλιν δὲ ἕτερον ἡμῖν ἀνα- κύπτει ζήτημα· Τί δήποτε ἀπὸ μὲν τῶν ἀκαθάρτων δύο δύο, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν καθα-	Now another question raises its head for us: why on earth was he to take the unclean ani-	Eusebius Em., <i>ap. Proc.</i> (GCS NF 22.202); Didymus, <i>In</i>

(cont.)

Case number	In Gen. hom. (PG; trans. FOC)	Biblical text	Chrysostom's 'Questions'	English translation (modified)	Parallelia
			ρῶν ἐπτά ἐπτά; ... Πολλοὶ γὰρ πολλὰ περὶ τούτων μυθολογοῦσι ...	mals two by two, but the clean seven by seven? ... many people give many fanciful interpretations ...	Gen. 181–185 (SC 244.92–98)
12	25.2 (PG 53.220; FOC 82.128)	Gn 7,6	Ἄλλ' ἴσως ἂν τίς μαθεῖν ἐπιζητήσῃ, τίνος ἔνεκεν εἰπὼν, Ἐκατὸν εἴκοσι ἔτη ἔσονται αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀπαγγεῖλάμενος τοσαῦτα μακροθυμήσῃ, πρὸ τῆς τούτων συμπληρώσεως τὴν πανωλεθρίαν ἐπήγαγε.	But perhaps someone might be anxious to find out why God had said, <i>They will have a life of 120 years</i> , and promised to show long suffering for that length of time, and yet before the completion of that time brought on the disaster.	Origen, <i>Cath. in Ps.</i> 4,13–21 (TU 183.16–18); Ephrem, <i>Comm. Gen.</i> CSCO 60,19–30; Henana <i>apud</i> Isodad VI, 4 (123)
13	26.4 (PG 53.235; FOC 82.153)	Gn 8,8–9	Ἄξιον ἐνταῦθα διερευνήσασθαι πῶς ἀνωτέρω εἰποῦσα ἡ ἁγία Γραφή, ὅτι αἱ κεφαλαὶ τῶν ὀρέων ὤφθησαν, νῦν φησιν, ὅτι οὐχ εὐρούσα ἡ περιστερὰ ἀναπαυσιν ὑπέστρεψε πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν, ὅτι τὸ ὕδωρ ἦν ἐπὶ πάντῳ τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς.	It is worth examining at this point how previously Sacred Scripture said that the mountain peaks had become visible, but now says that the dove found nowhere to rest and came back to him in the ark, because water covered the whole face of the earth.	Anonymous, <i>Cat.</i> 732 (TEG 2.145–146)
14	28.4 (PG 53.256; FOC 82.191)	Gn 9,18	Ἄξιον ἐνταῦθα ζητήσαι, τίνος ἔνεκεν τῶν τριῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Νῶε μνημονεύσασα ἡ θεία Γραφή ἐπήγαγε ... Τίνος οὖν ἔνεκεν ἐπεσημάνετο καὶ προσέθηκεν, ὅτι <i>Χάμ δὲ ἦν πατὴρ τοῦ Χαναάν</i> ;	It is worth enquiring at this point why, in mentioning three sons of Noah, scripture adds ... why therefore does it recall and add that <i>Cham was the father of Canaan</i> ?	Origen, <i>Coisl.</i> 160 (CCSG 15.156–157)
15	28.4 (PG 53.257; FOC 82.192)	Gn 9,18	Ἄλλ' ἐντεῦθεν ἡμῖν πάλιν ἕτερον τίκεται ζήτημα, τὸ πολυθρύλλητον ἐκεῖνο καὶ πανταχοῦ περιφερόμενον, τίνος ἔνεκεν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀμαρτόντος ὁ υἱὸς τὴν κατάραν δέχεται;	At this point, however, another question arises for us, that well known one that is bandied about everywhere: why does the son receive the curse when it is the	Origen, <i>Coisl.</i> 160 (CCSG 15.156–157)

(cont.)

Case number	In Gen. hom. (PG; trans. FOC)	Biblical text	Chrysostom's 'Questions'	English translation (modified)	Parallelia
16	29.3 (PG 53.264; FOC 82.204)	Gn 9,20–21	ἀλλ' ἄξιον ζητήσαι εἰ νῦν αὐτὸς ἐξηγῶρε τὸ φυτὸν, ἢ ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἦν παραχθέν ... μὴ μέντοι γνώριμον εἶναι τοῦ φυτοῦ τὴν χρῆσιν	father who is guilty of sin? It is worth enquiring whether he personally invented the growing of crops at this stage, or if this was the result of creation right from the very outset ... yet the usefulness of crop-growing was hardly known.	Origen, <i>Cat.</i> 783 (TEG 2.175); Bas. C., <i>De jej.</i> 1.5 (PG 31.169); Eusebius Em., <i>Cat.</i> 781 (TEG 2.174)
17	29.6 (PG 53.269; FOC 82.212–213)	Gn 9,25	Ἴδου ἐφθάσαμεν εἰς τὸ ζήτημα τὸ πανταχοῦ περιφερόμενον. Πολλῶν γὰρ ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι λεγόντων· τίνος ἔνεκεν, τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμαρτηκότος, καὶ τὴν γύμνωσιν ἐξαγγείλαντος, ὁ παῖς τὴν κατάραν δέχεται ... καὶ δέχεσθε τὴν τούτου λύσιν ... Ὅτι γὰρ οὔτε πατέρες ὑπὲρ τέκνων, οὔτε τέκνα ὑπὲρ πατέρων δίκην διδόασιν	Lo, we have come to the question mooted on all sides: you can hear lots of people asking, Why is it that, though the father was at fault in publicizing his parent's nakedness, it is the son who bears the curse? ... Heed the solution of the problem ... Parents are not punished for their children, nor children for their parents	Origen, <i>Coisl.</i> 160 (CCSG 15.156); <i>Cels.</i> 8.40 (SVC 54.554); Bas. C., <i>Ep.</i> 223.4 (III.15); Ambrosiaster, <i>QVNT</i> 14.3 (CSEL 50.40)
18	31.3 (PG 53.285; FOC 82.242)	Gn 11,31–Ac 7,2, 4	Ἴδου γὰρ ἐν προοιμίῳ δοκεῖ ζήτημα εἶναι ἐν τοῖς εἰρημένοις ... τοῦ Μωϋσέως λέγω, εἰπόντος, ὅτι Ἔλαβε Θάρρα τὸν Ἀβραμ καὶ τὸν Ναχώρ, καὶ ἐξήγαγεν ἐκ γῆς Χαλδαίων ... Στέφανος ἐγκωμιάζων ... Ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δόξης ὤφθη τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ ὄντι ἐν Μεσοποταμίᾳ, πρὶν ἢ κατοικῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐν Χαβράν ... Τί οὖν ἐστίν; ἐναντιοῦται ἑαυτῇ ἡ θεία Γραφή;	Note, in fact, right in the beginning there seems to be a question in the words used ... Moses, I mean, says, <i>Tharra took Abram and Nachor and led them from the land of Chaldea</i> ... Stephen praising ... <i>The God of glory appeared to our father Abraham when he was in Mesopotamia before he settled in Charraan</i> ... So what does that mean? Is Sacred Scripture contradicting itself?	Eusebius of Emesa, <i>Comm. Gen.</i> 11,31 (TEG 15.106)

(cont.)

Case number	In Gen. hom. (PG; trans. FOC)	Biblical text	Chrysostom's 'Questions'	English translation (modified)	Parallelia
19	35.4 (PG 53.326; FOC 82.312)	Gn 14,11–13	Ἀλλ' ἴσως ἐνταῦθα ἂν τις ζητήσῃ· τίνος ἔνεκεν μόνος τῶν ἐν Σοδόμοις πεφευγόντων ὁ δίκαιος Λῶτ εἰς τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν ἀπάγεται;	Perhaps at this point, however, someone might wonder, Why was it that the just man Lot, alone of the fugitives from Sodom, was taken into captivity?	Origen <i>apud</i> Procopius, <i>Ecl. Gen. ad</i> 13,7 (GCS NF 22.244)
20	37.3 (PG 53.346; FOC 82.347)	Gn 15,16	Ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα ἂν τις διαπορήσῃ πῶς τετρακόσια ἔτη ἔφη δουλεύειν αὐτοὺς, καίτοι οὐδὲ τὰ ἡμίση τούτων πεπονηκότων αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον.	At this point someone may raise the difficulty of how he said they would be slaves for '400 years' whereas in fact they spent not even half that time in Egypt	ChronQ <i>apud</i> Procopius <i>Ecl. Gen. ad</i> 15,5 (GCS NF 22.252–253)
21	44.4 (PG 54.411; FOC 82.465)	Gn 19,31–32	... τῷ δίκαιῳ, ὅτι ὅλως οὐκ ἦδει τὸ γεγονός; Ἀλλὰ πάλιν ἕτερον ἀνακύπτει ζήτημα τὸ τῆς μέθης. Δεῖ γὰρ πάντα διερευνᾶσθαι	... The just man was completely unaware of what happened. Still another question, however, arises in the case of intoxication. It is necessary to study everything carefully	Origen, <i>Cat.</i> 1152 (TEG 3.161) Eusebius Em. <i>Cat.</i> 1158 (TEG 3)
22	49.1 (PG 54.445; FOC 87.44)	Gn 25,21	Ἐν τούτῳ πρῶτον ἄξιον ζητῆσαι, τίνος ἔνεκεν, βίου οὕσα θαυμαστοῦ καὶ αὐτῇ, καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς, καὶ πολλῆς τῆς σωφροσύνης ἀμφοτέροι ἐπιμελούμενοι, στεῖρα ᾔν;	One question is worth raising initially: if she and her husband were conspicuous for their good life and both concerned for a very chaste living, why was she barren?	
23	67.1 (PG 54.572; FOC 87.)	Gn 48,18–22	Ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα εὐκαίρως ζητήσῃεν ἂν τις, τίνος ἔνεκεν οἰκειωσάμενος τὸ γεγεννημένον, ὁ μετὰ ταῦτα μέλλων διατάττεσθαι, ἀναγραφτὸν τὴν κατ' αὐτῶν ποιεῖται κατηγορίαν; Οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἐναντιούμενος ὁ δίκαιος, ἀλλὰ δεικνὺς τὸ ἥμερον αὐτοῦ τῆς γνώμης ...	At this point, however, someone may inquire why, after claiming the deed for himself, he would later make his will and record in it an accusation against them. Far from being inconsistent the good man showed the mildness of his manner in acting against his inclination ...	Origen, <i>Cat.</i> 2108 (TEG 4.342); Eusebius Em., <i>Comm. Gen.</i> 157 (TEG 15.168)

Sample Biblical Noun Glosses According to ‘Habit’ in Late Antique Christian Authors

Author (reference)	Biblical text	Biblical term	Gloss
Basil (GCS NF 2.43–44)	Gen 1,6	Firmament (τοῦ στερεώματος)	The things excelling in strength (τῶν κατ’ ἰσχύν ὑπερβαλλόντων)
Basil (GCS NF 2.76)	Gen 1,11–12	Seeds (σπέρματα)	Weeds (ζιζάνια)
Diodore (CCSG 6.29)	Ps 5,4	Initially (πρωί)	Haste (τὸ τάχος)
Diodore (CCSG 6.52)	Ps 9,2	I tell (διηγέσσομαι)	Those rejoicing (οἱ εὐχαριστοῦντες)
Diodore (CCSG 6.286)	Ps 47,5	Kings (βασιλεῖς)	Powers (δυνατοὺς)
Diodore (CCSG 6.288)	Ps 47,9	Ages (αἰῶνας)	Temporary times (τὰ πρόσκαιρα)
Diodore (STAAB 104)	Rom 11,12	Fullness (πληρωμα)	Fulfilling righteousness and piety (τὸ πεπληρωμένον εὐσεβείας καὶ θεογνωσίας)
Chrys. (SC 304.134)	Isa 2,8	Abominations (βδέλυγμα)	Idols (εἰδωλα)
Chrys. (HM 1.65a)	Isa 7,14; Ps 148,12	Young ones (νεανίσκοι)	Virgins (παρθένοι)
Origen (PG 12.397b)	Lev 1,2	Gifts (δῶρα)	Sacrifices (θυσίαι)
Theodore (CCSG 15.281)	Gen 49,11	Wine (οἶνω)	Punishments and death (τιμωρίας καὶ τοὺς θανάτους)

Manuscripts Mentioned

<i>Barberinus</i> 569	207
<i>BL Add.</i> 17,189	142
<i>BL Add.</i> 17,217	193
<i>BL Add.</i> 12156	155
<i>Leningrad Public Library Salt. gr.</i> 124	239
<i>Magdalensis</i> 3	XVIII, XIX
<i>Monacensis gr.</i> 377	107
<i>Monacensis gr.</i> 358	287
<i>Moscow Synodal Library</i> 385	197
<i>Novi Collegii</i> 71	XVIII
<i>Vatopedi</i> 236	82
<i>Venetus Marcianus gr.</i> 573	193
<i>Venetus Marcianus gr.</i> 11.178	107
<i>Vaticanus gr.</i> 762	252

Bibliography

Septuagint Translations, Editions, and Versions

La Bible d'Alexandrie

L'Exode. A. Le Boulluec–P. Sandevor, BA 2. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989.

La Genèse. M. Harl, BA 1. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989.

Le Lévitique. P. Harlé–D. Pralon, BA 3. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1988.

Les Nombres. G. Dorival, BA 4. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994.

Osée. E. Bons–J. Joosten–S. Kessler, BA 23/1. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2002.

Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis Editum

Deuteronomium J.W. Wevers (ed.), VTG 3/2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.

Ezekiel. J. Ziegler (ed.), VTG 16/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952.

Jeremiah. J. Ziegler (ed.), VTG 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.

Numbers. J.W. Wevers (ed.), VTG 3/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco. J. Ziegler–O. Munnich–D. Fraenkel (eds.), VTG 16/2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.

Hexapla

*Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum
Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*, 2 vols, F. Field (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon, 1875.

Greek Catenaes, Collectio Coisliniana, Creeds

Die älteren griechischen Katenen zum Buch Hiob, U. and D. Hagedorn (eds.), PTS 40. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994.

Enchiridon symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum, H. Denzinger (ed.). Freiburg: Herder, 1911.

Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois (fragments tirés des chaînes), R. Devreesse (ed.), ST 201. Vatican City, Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1959.

Catenaes graecae in Genesim et in Exodum. II: Collectio Coisliniana, F. Petit (ed.), CCSG 15. Turnhout–Leuven: Peeters, 1986.

Catena in Sancti Pauli. Epistolam ad Romanos, J.A. Cramer (ed.), CGPNT 4. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1844.

Catenaes in Sancti Pauli. Epistolas ad Galatas, Ephesios, Philippenses, Colossenses, Thessalonicenses, J.A. Cramer (ed.), CGPNT 6. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1844.

- Essai sur la Chaîne de l'Octateuque, avec une édition des commentaires de Diodore de Tarse qui s'y trouvent contenus*, J. Deconinck (ed.), BEHE 195. Paris: H. Champion, 1912.
- La Chaîne sur l'Exode. Édition intégrale II. Collectio Coisliniana; III. Fonds caténique ancien (Exode 1,1–15,21)*, F. Petit (ed.), TEG 10. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Édition intégrale. I: Chapitres 1 à 3*, F. Petit (ed.), TEG 1. Leuven: Peeters, 1991.
- La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Édition intégrale. II: Chapitres 4 à 11*, F. Petit (ed.), TEG 2. Leuven: Peeters, 1993.
- La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Édition intégrale. III: Chapitres 12 à 28*, F. Petit (ed.), TEG 3. Leuven: Peeters, 1995.
- La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Édition intégrale. IV: Chapitres 29 à 50*, F. Petit (ed.), TEG 4. Leuven: Peeters, 1996.
- La Chaîne palestinienne sur le Psaume 118*, 2 vols., M. Harl (ed.-trans.), SC 189–190. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1972.
- Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche, aus Katenenhandschriften*, K. Staab (ed.). Münster: Aschendorf, 1984².
- Sévère d'Antioche. Fragments grecs tirés des chaînes sur les derniers livres de l'Octateuque et sur les Règles*, F. Petit (ed.-trans.), TEG 14. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.

Ancient Literature

- Adrian, *Introductio in sacras scripturas*, in P.W. Martens (ed.-trans.), *Adrian's Introduction to the Divine Scriptures: An Antiochene Handbook for Scriptural Interpretation*, OECT. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Aelius Theon, *Progyrnasmata*, M. Patillon (ed.). Paris: CUFr, 1997.
- Alexander Aphrodisias, *Quaestiones*, I. Bruns (ed.), CAG SUPP. 2/2. Berlin: Reimer, 1892.
- Ambrose, *De Apologia Prophetarum David*, C. Schenkl (ed.), CSEL 32/2. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1897.
- Ambrose, *De Cain, De paradiso, De Noe*, C. Schenkl (ed.), CSEL 32/1. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1898.
- Ambrose, *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam*, M. Adriaen (ed.), CSEL 14. Turnhout: Brepols, 1957.
- Ambrose, *Explanatio psalmorum*, M. Petschenig (ed.), CSEL 64. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1919.
- Ambrose, *Expositio in Psalmum cxviii*, M. Petschenig (ed.), CSEL 62.2. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1918.
- Ambrose, *De Paenitentia*, O. Faller (ed.), CSEL 73. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1955.
- Ambrosiaster (Pseudo-Augustini), *Quaestiones veteris et novi testamenti cxxvii*, A. Souter (ed.), CSEL 50. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1908.

- Amphilochius, *Contra haereses*, in *Amphilochii Iconiensis opera*, C. Datema (ed.), CCSG 3. Turnhout–Leuven: Brepols, 1978.
- Anonymous, *Homilia e BL Add. 17,189*, in T. Jansma (trans.), 'Une homélie anonyme sur la chute d'Adam. 11: L'homélie et l'exégèse sur laquelle elle est basée', *OrSyr* 5 (1960) 159–182; 253–292.
- Aristophanes Grammaticus, *Excerptorum Constantini de natura animalium*, in *Aristophanis historiae animalium epitome*, S.P. Lambros (ed.), CAG SUPP. 1. Berlin: Reimer, 1885.
- Aristotle, *De anima*, ed. G. Biehl. Leipzig: Teubner, 1896.
- Asterius of Amasea, *Homiliae*, in *Asterius of Amasea. Homilies i–xiv*, C. Datema (ed.). Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG 27.59–590. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- Athanasius, *De Synodis, De Decretis Nicaenae synodi*, H.G. Opitz (ed.), AW 2/1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1936.
- Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, E. Hoffmann (ed.), CSEL 40/1–2. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1899–1900.
- Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber*, J. Zycha (ed.), CSEL 28/1. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1894.
- Augustine, *Contra epistulam fundamenti*, J. Zycha (ed.), CSEL 25/1. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1891.
- Barhadbeshabba, *Causa foundationis scholarum*, A. Scher (ed.), *Mar Barhadbšabba 'Arbaya, évêque de Halwan (vi^e siècle). Cause de la fondation des écoles*, PO 18. Turnhout: Brepols, 1981².
- Basil of Caesarea, *Adversus Eunomium*, in B. Sesboüé (ed.-trans.), *Basile de Césarée, Contre Eunome, 1: Livre 1*, SC 299. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1982.
- Basil of Caesarea, *Epistulae*, in Y. Courtonne (ed.-trans.), *Saint Basile. Lettres*, 3 vols, Les Belles Lettres. Paris: Éditions du Cerf 1957–1966.
- Basil of Caesarea, R.J. Deferrari (trans.), *Saint Basil: The Letters*, 4 vols., LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–1934.
- Basil of Caesarea, *Hexaameron*, in E. Amand de Mendieta–S.Y. Rudberg (eds.), *Homilien zum Hexaameron*, GCS NF 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.
- Basil of Caesarea, *De jejunio* 1, PG 31.164–184. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- Basil of Caesarea, *On Fasting and Feasts: Saint Basil the Great*, M. DelCogliano (trans.), PPS 50. Yonkers, NY: St Valdimir's Seminary Press, 2013.
- Basil of Caesarea, *Quod deus non est auctor malorum*, PG 31.329–353. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae brevius tractatae*, PG 31.1051–1321. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- 1 Clement, in M.W. Holmes (ed.-trans.), *The Apostolic Fathers. Greek Texts and English Translations. 3rd Edition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2007, 44–132.
- Clement of Alexandria, *Protepticus*, in *Clemens Alexandrinus 1, Protepticus und Paedagogus*, O. Stählin (ed.), GCS 12. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1905.

- Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, in *Clemens Alexandrinus II, Stromata I–VI*, O. Stählin–L. Früchtel (eds.), GCS 52. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960².
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Iulianum*, in Ch. Riedweg (ed.), *Kyrrill von Alexandrien. Contra Iulianum. Volumen 1. Gegen Julian. Buch 1–5*, GCS NF 20. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Iulianum*, in W. Kinzig–T. Brüggemann–H. Kaufhold (eds.), *Kyrrill von Alexandrien. Contra Iulianum. Volumen 2. Gegen Julian. Buch 6–10 und Fragmente*, GCS NF 21. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017.
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarius in Lucam*, PG 72.475–949. Paris: Migne, 1859.
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaphyra in Genesim*, PG 69.14–383. Paris: Migne, 1864.
- Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses*, PG 33.331–1058. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- Didymus, *In Genesim*, in P. Nautin–L. Doutreleau (eds.-trans.), *Sur la Genèse. Texte inédit d'après un papyrus de Tura*, SC 233, 244. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1976–1978.
- Didymus, *Commentarius in Psalmos*, in L. Doutreleau–A. Gesiché–M. Gronewald (eds.-trans.), *Didymos der Blinde. Psalmenkommentar (Tura-Papyrus)*, PTA 4, 6–8, 12. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1968–1970.
- Didymus, *Commentarius in Iob*, in A. Henrichs–U. Hagedorn–D. Hagedorn–L. Könen (eds.), *Didymus der Blinde. Kommentar zu Hiob (Tura-Papyrus)*, PTA 1. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1968.
- Didymus, *Fragmenta in Psalmos*, E. Muhlenberg (ed.), PTS 16. Berlin: Rudolf Habelt, 1978.
- Diodore, *Commentarii in Psalmos I–L*, J.-M. Olivier (ed.), CCSG 6. Turnhout: Brepols, 1980.
- Diodore, *Diodore of Tarsus: Commentary on the Psalms 1–51*, R.C. Hill (trans.), WGRW 9. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Diodore *apud Florilegium Edessenum anonymum*, in J. Behr (ed.), *The Case Against Diodore and Theodore. Texts and their Contexts. The Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius (Cod. Add. 12156)*, OECT. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, 168–195.
- Dionysius Thrax, *De Thucydide*, H. Usener–L. Radermacher (eds.). Leipzig–Berlin: Teubner, 1899.
- Dionysius Thrax, *Ars grammatica*, G. Uhlig (ed.), GG 1/1. Leipzig–Berlin: Teubner, 1883.
- Diyarbakir Commentary, in L. Van Rompay (ed.) *Le commentaire sur Genèse–Exode 9,32 du manuscrit (olim) Diyarbakir 22*, CSCO 483–484. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.
- Elias, *In Porphyrii isagogen et Aristotelis categorias commentaria*, A. Busse (eds.), CAG 18/1. Berlin: Reimer, 1900.
- Ephrem, *In Genesim commentarii*, in R.M. Tonneau (ed.-trans.), *Sancti Ephraem Syri in Genesim et in Exodum commentarii*, CSCO 152–153. Leuven: Peeters, 1955.
- Ephrem, *De Paradiso Eden*, in E. Beck (ed.-trans.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de Paradiso und Contra Iulianum*, CSCO 174–175. Leuven: Peeters, 1957.

- Ephrem, *St. Ephrem the Syrian: Hymns on Paradise*, S. Brock (trans.), PPS. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990.
- Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, in K. Holl (ed.) *Epiphanius I, Ancoratus und Panarion, Haer. 1–33*, GCS 25. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1915.
- Epiphanius, *Panarion*, in K. Holl (ed.), *Epiphanius III, Panarion, Haer. 65–80*, GCS 37. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985².
- Eunomius, *Apologia*, in R.P. Vaggione (ed.-trans.), *Eunomius. The Extant Works*, OECT. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Esaiam*, in J. Ziegler (ed.), *Der Jesajakommentar, Eusebius Werke IX*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1975.
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Lucam*, PG 24.528–606. Paris: Migne, 1957.
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Psalmos*, PG 23. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Chronicon*, in J. Karst (trans.), *Eusebius Werke v, Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen übersetzt*, GCS 20. Leipzig: J.C. Henrichs, 1911.
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Demonstratio Evangelica*, in I.A. Heikel (ed.), *Eusebius Werke VI, Die Demonstratio evangelica*, GCS 23. Leipzig: J.C. Henrichs 1913.
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Eclogae Propheticae*, in T. Gaisford (ed.), *Eusebii Caesariensis. Eclogae Propheticae*. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1842.
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia ecclesiastica*, in E. Schwartz–T. Mommsen (eds.), *Eusebius Werke III, Die Kirchengeschichte*, GCS 9/1–2. Leipzig: J.C. Henrichs, 1903, 1908.
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Onomastica sacra*, in S. Timm (ed.), *Eusebius Werke III. Erster Teil, Das Onomastikon der biblischen Ortsnamen: Kritische Neuausgabe des griechischen Textes mit der lateinischen Fassung des Hieronymus*, GCS NF 24. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017.
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, in K. Mras (ed.), *Eusebius Werke VIII, Die Praeparatio Evangelica*, GCS 43/1–2. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1983².
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Quaestiones ad Stephanum et Marinum*, in C. Zamagni (ed.-trans.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Questions évangéliques*, SC 523. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2008.
- Eusebius of Emesa, *Commentarius in Octateuchum*, in F. Petit–L. Van Rompay–J.J.S. Weitenberg (trans.), *Eusèbe d'Émèse. Commentaire de la Genèse. Texte arménien de l'édition de Venise (1980). Fragments grecs et syriaques*, TEG 15. Leuven–Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2011.
- Eustathius of Antioch, *Engastrimytha*, in J. Declerck (ed.), *Eustathii Antiocheni, patris Nicaeni, opera quae supersunt omnia*, CCSG 51. Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.
- Galen, *De differentiis pulsuum*, C.G. Kühn (ed.), CGOA 8. Leipzig: Teubner, 1821.
- Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epistulae*, in Grégoire de Nazianze, *Lettres Théologiques* (101, 102, 202), eds.-trans. P. Gallay–M. Jourjon (SC 208). Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1974.
- Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orationes*

- Gregory of Nazianzus, *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 27–31*, J. Bernardi (ed.-trans.), SC 250. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978.
- Gregory of Nazianzus, *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 38–41*, C. Moreschini–P. Gallay (eds.-trans.), SC 358. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1990.
- Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio xi*, PG 35.832–841. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio xviii*, PG 35.985–1044. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Ablabium*, F. Müller (ed.), GNO 3/1.35–58. Leiden: Brill, 1958.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Theophilum, adversus Apolinaristas*, F. Müller (ed.), GNO 3/1.119–128. Leiden: Brill, 1958.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium et Ruftatio confessionis Eunomii. Pars Prior: Liber I et II (vulgo I et xiiib). Pars altera: Liber III (vulgo III–xii)*, W. Jaeger (ed.), GNO 1–2. Leiden: Brill, 1960².
- Gregory of Nyssa, *De anima et resurrectione*, A. Spira, (ed.), GNO 3/3. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *De oratione Dominica*, V.W. Callahan (ed.), GNO 7/2.5–75. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum canticorum homiliae*, H. Langerbeck (ed.), GNO 6. Leiden: Brill, 1960.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *In Hexaemeron*, H.R. Drobner (ed.), GNO 4/1. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio catechetica*, E. Mühlenberg (ed.), GNO 3/4. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *In xl martyres II*, O. Lendle (ed.), GNO 10/1.159–169. Leiden: Brill, 1990.
- Gregory of Nyssa, J. Leemans (trans.), “Let us Die that We May Live.” *Greek Homilies on Christian Martyrs from Asia Minor, Palestine and Syria (c. AD 350–AD 450)*. London–New York Routledge, 2003, 91–107.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *De deitate filii et spiritus sancti et in Abraham*, E. Rhein (ed.), GNO 10/2.117–144. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Heraclitus, *Quaestiones Homericae*, in D.A. Russel–D. Konstan (eds.-trans.), *Heraclitus: Homeric Problems*, WGRW 14. Atlanta, GA: The Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Hilary, *De synodis seu fide Orientalium*, PL 10.471–545. Paris: Migne, 1845.
- Hilary, *Tractatus super Psalmos*, A. Zingerle (ed.), CSEL 22. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1891.
- Hippolytus, *De David et Goliath*, in G. Garitte (ed.-trans.), *Traité d'Hippolyte sur David et Goliath, sur le Cantique des cantiques et sur l'Antéchrist*, CSCO 263–264. Leuven: Peeters, 1965.
- Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, M. Marcovich (ed.), PTS 25. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.
- Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, in F. Sagnard (ed.-trans.), *Contre les hérésies III*, SC 34. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952.
- Jerome, *Epistulae*, in I. Hilberg (ed.), *Sancti Evsebi Hieronymi Epistulae*, CSEL 54–56. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1910.
- Jerome, *Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum*, P. de Lagarde (ed.), CCSL 72. Turnhout: Brepols, 1959².

- Jerome, *Saint Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis*, C.T.R. Hayward (trans.), OECs. Oxford Early Christian Studies, 1995.
- Jerome, *De viris inlustribus*, in E.C. Richardson (ed.), *Hieronymus Liber de viris inlustribus. Gennadius Liber de viris inlustribus*, TU 14/1. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1896.
- Jerome, *Commentarius in Daniele*, PL 25.491–583. Paris: Migne, 1845.
- Jerome, *Commentarii in Prophetas Minores*, in M. Adriaen (ed.), *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri. Opera Exegetica* 6, CCSL 76. Turnhout: Brepols, 1969².
- John Chrysostom, *In Acta apostolorum homiliae*, PG 60.13–582. Paris: Migne, 1862.
- John Chrysostom, *Adversus Judaeos*, PG 48.843–944. Paris: Migne, 1862.
- John Chrysostom, *Catecheses ad illuminandos*, in A. Wenger (ed.-trans.), *Huit catéchèses baptismales inédites*, SC 50. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1957.
- John Chrysostom, *Catechesis de iuramento*, in A. Piédagnel (ed.-trans.), *Trois catéchèses baptismales*, SC 366.166–208. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2008².
- John Chrysostom, *Catechesis ultima ad baptizandos*, in A. Piédagnel (ed.-trans.), *Trois catéchèses baptismales*, SC 366.212–242. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2008².
- John Chrysostom, *De Christi precibus*, in A.-M. Malingrey (ed.-trans.), *Contre les Anoméens. Homélie VII–XII*, SC 396.238–282. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2008².
- John Chrysostom, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, in J. Dumortier–A. Liefoghe (eds.-trans.), *Commentaire sur Isaïe*, SC 304. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1983.
- John Chrysostom, *De consubstantiali*, in A.-M. Malingrey (ed.-trans.), *Contre les Anoméens. Homélie VII–XII*, SC 396.108–162. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2008².
- John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Colossenses homiliae*, F. Field (ed.), EP 5.172–312. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1852.
- John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Ephesios homiliae*, F. Field (ed.), EP 4.104–365. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1852.
- John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos homiliae*, F. Field (ed.), EP 7. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1862.
- John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Philippenses homiliae*, F. Field (ed.), EP 5.1–171. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1852.
- John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Thessalonicenses homiliae*, F. Field (ed.), EP 5.314–496. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1855.
- John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Corinthios posteriorem*, F. Field (ed.), EP 3. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1845.
- John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Timotheum homiliae*, F. Field (ed.), EP 6.1–263. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1861.
- John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Romanos homiliae*, F. Field (ed.), EP 1. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1849.
- John Chrysostom, *Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt*, in A.-M. Malingrey (ed.-trans.), *Sur la providence de Dieu*, SC 79. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2000².
- John Chrysostom, *Expositio in Psalmos*, PG 55.35–527. Paris: Migne, 1862.

- John Chrysostom, *Homilia dicta praesente imperatore*, PG 63.473–478. Paris: Migne, 1862.
- John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Genesim*, PG 53–54.580. Paris: Migne, 1862.
- John Chrysostom, *St. John Chrysostom. Homilies on Genesis 1–17; 18–45; 46–67*, R.C. Hill (trans.), FOC 74, 82, 87. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1986–1992.
- John Chrysostom, *Ad illuminandos catechesis 1*, in A. Piédagnel (ed. trans.), *Trois catéchèses baptismales*, SC 366.112–162. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2008².
- John Chrysostom, *De incomprehensibili dei natura*, in A.-M. Malingrey–R. Flacelière (eds.-trans.), *Sur l'incompréhensibilité de Dieu*, SC 28^{bis}. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970.
- John Chrysostom, *In Iohannem homiliae*, PG 59. Paris: Migne, 1862.
- John Chrysostom, *In Laudem Diodori Tarsensis*, PG 52.761–766. Paris: Migne, 1859.
- John Chrysostom, *In Matthaeum homiliae*, F. Field (ed.), MH 1–2. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1839.
- John Chrysostom, *De mutatione nominum homiliae 1–2*, PG 51.113–132. Paris: Migne, 1859.
- John Chrysostom, *De mutatione nominum homiliae 3–4*, PG 51.132–156. Paris: Migne, 1859.
- John Chrysostom, *De prophetiarum obscuritate homiliae*, in S. Zincone (ed.-trans.), *Giovanni Crisostomo. Omelie sull'oscurità delle profezie*, VS 12. Rome: Edizioni Studium, 1998.
- John Chrysostom, *In Oziam*, in J. Dumortier (ed.-trans.), *Homélies sur Ozias*, SC 277. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1981.
- John Chrysostom, *De petitione matris filiorum Zebedaei*, in A.-M. Malingrey (ed.-trans.), *Contre les Anoméens. Homélies VII–XII*, SC 396.166–208. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994.
- John Chrysostom, *In principium Actorum homiliae 1–2*, PG 51.67–87. Paris: Migne, 1859.
- John Chrysostom, *In principium Actorum homiliae 3–4*, PG 51.88–112. Paris: Migne, 1859.
- John Chrysostom, *In prodicionem Judae*, PG 49.373–392. Paris: Migne, 1862.
- John Chrysostom, *De profectu Evangelii*, PG 51.311–320. Paris: Migne, 1859.
- John Chrysostom, *De sacerdotio*, in A.-M. Malingrey (ed.-trans.), *Sur le sacerdoce*, SC 272. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1980.
- John Chrysostom, *De sanctis martyribus sermo*, PG 50.645–654. Paris: Migne, 1862.
- John Chrysostom, *Sermo 9 in Genesim*, PG 56.619–630. Paris: Migne, 1862.
- John Chrysostom, *Sermones in Genesim*, in L. Brottier (ed.-trans.), *Jean Chrysostome. Sermons sur la Genèse*, SC 433. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1998.
- John Chrysostom, *Ad Stagirium ascetam a daemónio vexatum*, PG 47.424–494. Paris: Migne, 1863.
- John Chrysostom, *De statu ad populum Antiochenum habitae*, PG 49.15–223. Paris: Migne, 1862.
- John Chrysostom, *De virginitate*, in H. Musurilo–B. Grillet (eds.-trans.), *La Virginité*, SC 125. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966.

- John Chrysostom (?), *Synopsis scripturae sacrae*, PG 56.313–396. Paris: Migne, 1862.
- Josephus, *Antiquitatum Iudaicarum*, vol. 1, B. Niese (ed.), FIO 1. Berlin, Weidmann, 1887.
- Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, in P. Bobichon (ed.-trans.), *Justin Martyr. Dialogue avec Tryphon*, PAR 47/1. Freiburg: Academic Press, 2003.
- İšo'dad, *Commentaire d'İšo'dad de Merv sur l'ancien testament. 1. Genèse*, I.M. Vosté–C. van den Eynde (eds.-trans.), CSCO 126, 156. Leuven: Peeters, 1950–1955.
- Melito of Sardis, *De Pascha*, in S.G. Hall (ed.-trans.), *Melito of Sardis. On Pascha and Fragments*, OECT. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- Origen, *Catholica in psalmos*, in C. Bandt–F.X. Risch–B. Villani (eds.), *Die Prologtexte zu den Psalmen von Origenes und Eusebius*, TU 183.10–26. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2018.
- Origen, *Commentarius in Cantica Canticorum*, in W.A. Baehrens (ed.), *Origenes Werke VIII. Homilien zu Samuel 1, zum Hohelied und zu den Propheten. Kommentar zum Hohelied*, in *Rufinus und Hieronymus Übersetzungen*, GCS 33. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1925.
- Origen, *Commentarius in Epistolam s. Pauli ad Romanos*, in C.P. Hammond Bammel (ed.), *Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes*, AGLB 10. Freiburg: Herder, 1990.
- Origen, *Commentarius in Mattheum*
- Origen, *Origenes Werke x, Matthäuserklärung 1. Die Griechisch erhaltenen Tomoi*, E. Klostermann–E. Benz (eds.), GCS 40. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1935.
- Origen, *Origenes Werke XI, Matthäuserklärung II. Die Lateinische Übersetzung der Commentariorum Series*, E. Klostermann–E. Benz–U. Treu (eds.), GCS 38. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1976².
- Origen, *Origenes Werke XII, Matthäuserklärung III: Fragmente*, E. Klostermann (ed.), GCS 41/1. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1941.
- Origen, *The Commentary of Origen on the Gospel of St Matthew*, 2 vols., trans. R.E. Heine (OECT). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Origen, *Contra Celsum libri VIII*, M. Marcovich (ed.), SVC 54. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Origen, *Definitiones*, in C. Bandt–F.X. Risch–B. Villani (eds.), *Die Prologtexte zu den Psalmen von Origenes und Eusebius*, TU 183.65–70. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2018.
- Origen, *Homiliae et fragmenta in Lucam*, in M. Rauer (ed.), *Origenes Werke IX, Die Homilien zu Lukas in der Übersetzung des Hieronymus und die griechischen Reste der Homilien und des Lukas-Kommentars*, GCS 49. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959.
- Origen, *Homiliae et selecta in Leviticum*, in W.A. Baehrens (ed.), *Origenes Werke VI, Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung, 1. Die Homilien zu Genesis, Exodus, und Leviticus*, GCS 29. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1920.
- Origen, *Homiliae in Ezechielem*, in W.A. Baehrens (ed.), *Origenes Werke VIII. Homilien zu Samuel 1, zum Hohelied und zu den Propheten. Kommentar zum Hohelied*, in *Rufinus und Hieronymus Übersetzungen*, GCS 33. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1925.

- Origen, *Selecta in Ezechielem*, PG 13.767–824. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- Origen, *Homiliae in Genesim*, in P. Habermehl (ed.), *Origenes vi. Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins. Übersetzung. Teil 1: Die Homilien zu Genesis (Homiliae in Genesim)*, GCS NF 17. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012.
- Origen, *Homiliae in Jeremiam*, P. Husson–P. Nautin (eds.), *Origène. Homélie sur Jérémie*, SC 238. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1977.
- Origen, *Homiliae in librum Jesu Nave*, in W.A. Baehrens (ed.), *Origenes Werke VII. Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung. Zweiter Teil. Die Homilien zu Numeri, Josua und Judges*, GCS 30. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1921.
- Origen, *Homiliae in librum Regnorum*, P. Nautin (ed.-trans.), *Origène. Homélie sur Samuel*, SC 328. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1986.
- Origen, *Homiliae in Numeros*, in W.A. Baehrens (ed.), *Origenes Werke VII. Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung. Zweiter Teil. Die Homilien zu Numeri, Josua und Judges*, GCS 30. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1921.
- Origen, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, L. Perrone (ed.), *Origenes Werke XIII. Die neuen Psalmenhomilien. Eine kritische Edition des Codex Monacensis Graecus 314*, GCS NF 19. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.
- Origen, *In Johannem*, E. Presuchen (ed.), *Origenes Werke IV. Der Johanneskommentar*, GCS 10. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1903.
- Origen, *De oratione*, in P. Koetschau (ed.), *Origenes Werke II. Buch V–VIII Gegen Celsus. Die Schrift vom Gebet*, GCS 3. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899.
- Origen *apud Philocalia*
- Origen, *Origène. Philocalie 21–27. Sur le libre arbitre*, E. Junod (ed.-trans.), SC 226. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2006².
- Origen, *Origène. Philocalie 1–20. Sur les écritures. La lettre à Africanus sur l'Histoire de Suzanne*, M. Harl–N. de Lange (eds. trans.), SC 302. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1983.
- Origen, *Prooemium e commentario in psalmos*, in C. Bandt–F.X. Risch–B. Villani (eds.), *Die Prologtexte zu den Psalmen von Origenes und Eusebius*, TU 183.102–113. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2018.
- Origen, *Selecta in Deuteronomium*, PG 12.805–819. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- Origen, *Selecta in Psalmos*, PG 12.1053–1685. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- Origen, *De principiis*, J. Behr (ed.-trans.), *Origen: On First Principles*, 2 vols., OECT. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Palladius, *Dialogus de vita s. Joannis Chrysostomi*, A.-M. Malingrey–P. Leclercq (eds.-trans.), *Dialogue sur la vie de Jean Chrysostome*, 2 vols., SC 341–342. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1988.
- Philo, *De confusione linguarum*, P. Wendland (ed.), PAO 2.229–267. Berlin: Reimer, 1897.
- Philo, *De Cherubim*, L. Cohn (ed.), PAO 1.170–201. Berlin: Reimer, 1896.
- Philo, *De fuga et inventione*, P. Wendland (ed.), PAO 3.110–155. Berlin: Reimer, 1898.
- Philo, *Legum allegoriae I, II, III*, L. Cohn (ed.), PAO 1.61–169. Berlin: Reimer, 1896.

- Philo, *De migratione Abrahami*, L. Cohn (ed.), PAO 2.268–314. Berlin: Reimer, 1897.
- Philo, *De opificio mundi*, L. Cohn (ed.), PAO 1.1–60. Berlin: Reimer, 1896.
- Philo, *De posteritate Caini*, P. Wendland (ed.), PAO 2.1–41. Berlin: Reimer, 1897.
- Philo, *Quaestiones in Genesim*
- Philo, *Quaestiones in Genesim et in Exodum. Fragmenta Graeca*, F. Petit, (ed.), OPA 33. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978.
- Philo, *Philonis Judaei. Paralipomena Armena. Libri videlicet quatuor in Genesim. Liber duo in Exodum. Sermo unus de Sampson. Alter de Jona. Tertius de tribus angelis Abraamo apparentibus*, J.B. Aucher (ed.-trans.). Venice: S. Lazari, 1826.
- Philo, *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*, M. Harl (trans.), OPA 15. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966.
- Philo, *Quod Deus immutabilis sit*, P. Wendland, (ed.), PAO 2.56–94. Berlin: Reimer, 1897.
- Photius, *Bibliotheca*, R. Henry (ed.-trans.), *Photius. Bibliothèque, tome II* («codices» 84–185) and *tome IV* («codices» 223–229). Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1960, 1965.
- Plato, *Phaedo*, I. Burnet (ed.), *Plato's Phaedo*, *Platonis Opera* 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950².
- Porphyry, *Contra Christianos*, in M. Becker (ed.), *Porphyrios, "Contra Christianos". Neue Sammlung der Fragmente, Testimonien und Dubia*, TK 52. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.
- Porphyry, *Quaestiones Homericae ad Iliadem pertinentes*, in J.A. MacPahil (ed.-trans.), *Porphyry's "Homeric Questions" on the "Iliad"*, TK 36. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.
- Procopius, *Eclogarum in libros historicos Veteris Testamenti epitome. Teil 1. Der Genesiskommentar. Prokop von Gaza*, K. Metzler (ed.), GCS NF 22. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.
- Ps.-Gregory Thaumaturgus, *In Annuntiatione sanctae Virginis Mariae homilia 1*, PG 10.1145–1156. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, in D.A. Russel (trans.), *Quintilian: The Orator's Education*, LCL 124–127, 494. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Rufinus, *De jejuniis*, in H. Marti (ed.), *Rufin von Aquileia. De ieiunio 1, 11*, SVC 6. Leiden: Brill, 1989.
- Sextus Empiricus, *Adversos mathematicos*, J. Mau (ed.), SEO 3. Leipzig: Teubner, 1954.
- Sextus Empiricus, D.L. Blank (trans.), *Sextus Empiricus, Against the Grammarians (Adversos mathematicos 1)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Severian of Gabala, *In mundi creationem homiliae*, PG 56.429–500. Paris: Migne, 1862.
- Severian of Gabala, *De filio prodigio*, PG 59.628–635. Paris: Migne: 1862.
- Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physica Commentaria*, H. Diels (ed.), CAG 9–10. Berlin: Reimer, 1895.
- Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica*, in G.C. Hansen–M. Sirinjan (eds.), *Sokrates. Kirchengeschichte*, GCS NF 1. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1995.

- Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica*, in J. Bidez–G.C. Hansen (eds.), *Sozomenus: Kirchengeschichte*, GCS 50. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960.
- Theodore, *Commentarius in Psalmos*, in R. Devreesse (ed.), *Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes (I–LXXX)*, ST 93. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1939.
- Theodore, *Theodore of Mopsuestia. Commentary on Psalms 1–81*, R.C. Hill (trans.), WGRW 5. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Theodore, *Commentarius in XII Prophetas*, H.N. Sprenger (ed.), GO 5. Göttingen–Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1977.
- Theodore, *Homiliae catecheticae*, in R. Tonneau–R. Devreesse (eds.-trans.), *Les Homélie catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste. Reproduction phototypique du ms. Mingana Syr. 561 (Selly Oak Colleges' Library, Birmingham)*, ST 145. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1949.
- Theodore, *Commentarii et fragmenta graecorum in sanctum Iohannem*
- Theodore, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*, R. Devreesse (ed.), ST 141. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1948.
- Theodore, *Theodori Mopsuesteni commentarius in Euangelium Iohannis Apostoli*, J.-M. Vosté (ed.-trans.), CSCO 115–116. Leuven: Peeters, 1940.
- Theodore, *Fragmenta Syriaca*
- Theodore, *Theodori Mopsuesteni. E codicibus Musei Britannici Nitriacis*, E. Sachau (ed.). Leipzig: G. Engelmann, 1869.
- Theodore, *Fragmenta e Marc. Gr. 573*, in F. Petit (ed.-trans.), 'L'homme créé «à l'image» de Dieu. Quelques fragments grecs inédits de Théodore de Mopsueste', *Le Muséon* 100 (1987) 269–281.
- Theodore, *Fragmentum e BL add. 17,217*, in G.F. Rambow (trans.), "Theodore vs. the "Arians" and the Parable of Humanity's Creation: A Syriac Fragment of Theodore of Mopsuestia's *Commentary on Genesis* 1.26', *J ECS* 25.2 (2017) 231–254.
- Theodore, *Tractatus contra allegoristas*, in L. Van Rompay (ed.-trans.), *Théodore de Mopsueste. Fragments syriaques du Commentaire des Psaumes (Psaume 118 et Psaumes 138–148)*, CSCO 189. Leuven: Peeters, 1982.
- Theodore bar Koni, *Liber scholiorum. Pars prior*, A. Scher (ed.), CSCO 65. Leuven: Peeters, 1910.
- Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Genesim et in Exodum*, in J. Petruccione–R.C. Hill (eds.-trans.), *Theodoret of Cyrus: The Questions on the Octateuch*, 2 vols., LEC 1. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007.
- Theodoret, *Eranistes. Critical Text and Prolegomena*, G.H. Ettlinger (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Theodoret, *Interpretatio Epistolae ad Hebraeos*, PG 82.673–785. Paris: Migne, 1864.
- Theodoret, *Explanatio in Ezechielem*, PG 81.807–1254. Paris: Migne, 1864.
- Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum*, R.M. Grant (ed.-trans.), OECT. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

- Timaeus Locrus, *De natura mundi et animae*, W. Marg (ed.-trans.), PhAnt 24. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Titus of Bostra, *Contra Manichaeos libri IV, Graece et Syriace*, A. Roman–T.S. Schmidt–J. Declerck (Gr. ed.), P.-H. Poirier–É. Crégheur (Syr. ed.), CCSG 82. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.
- Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, A. Kroymann (ed.), CCSL 1.437–730. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954.
- Tertullian, *Adversus Hermogenem*, A. Kroymann (ed.), CCSL 1.395–436. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954.
- Tertullian, *De jejunia adversus psychicos*, A. Reifferscheid–G. Wissowa (eds.), CCSL 2.1255–1278. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954.

Rabbinic Literature

Midrash Bereshit Rabba

- Midrash Bereshit Rabba. *Midrash Bereshit Rabba. Critical Edition with Notes and Commentary*, 3 vols., J. Theodor–Ch. Albeck (eds.). Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1996².
- Midrash Bereshit Rabba. *The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis. A new American Translation, volume 1: Parashiyot One through Thirty-three on Genesis 1:1 to 8:14*, J. Neusner (trans.), BJS 104. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1985.

Ancient Lexica, Onomastica, Compilations, Excerpts, Suda

- Apion, *Fragmenta Glossae Homericæ*, in *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax*, K. Linke (ed.-trans.); *Die Fragmente der Grammatiker Tyrannion und Diokles*, W. Haas (ed.); *Apions Γλῶσσαι Ὀμηρικαί*, S. Neitzel (ed.), SGLG 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977.
- Hesychius, *Lexicon*, K. Latte–P.A. Hansen–I.C. Cunningham (eds.), SGLG 11/1–4. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1953–2018.
- Hesychius, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, K. Latte (ed.), HAL 1–2. Copenhagen: E. Munksgaard, 1953.
- Stobaeus, *Ioannis Stobei Anthologium*, O. Hense–C.W. Wachsmuth (eds.), vol. 2. Berlin: Weidmann, 1884.
- Sudae Lexicon*, vol. 1. Bekker (ed.). Berlin: Reimer, 1854.
- Codex Bremensis G II*, in U. Hagedorn (ed.), *Das Sogenannte „Kyrill“-Lexikon in der Fassung der Handschrift E (Codex Bremensis G II)*. 2005. kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/id/eprint/1813
- V-Recension*, in M. Naoumides (ed.), ‘The v-Recension of St. Cyril’s Lexicon’, *ICS* 4 (1979) 94–135.
- ΕΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ ΛΕΞΕΩΝ ΧΡΗΣΙΜΩΝ. *Texts of the Original Version and of MS. B*, I.C. Cunningham (ed.), SGLG 10. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

Modern Literature

- Adams, S.A.–S.M. Ehorn (eds.). *Composite Citations in Antiquity. Volume One: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- Adams, S.A. 'Philo's *Questions* and the Adaptation of Greek Philosophical Curriculum', in J. Zurawski–G. Boccaccini (eds.), *Second Temple Jewish Paideia in Context*, BZNW 228. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017, 167–184.
- Albl, M.C. (trans.). *Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa: Testimonies against the Jews*, WGRW 8. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2004.
- Albl, M.C. *"And Scripture Cannot be Broken": The Form and Function of the Early Christian testimonia Collections*, NovTSup 96. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Alexandre, M.–G. Dorival–A. Le Boulluec (eds.), *Origeniana Sexta. Origène et la Bible*, BETL 118. Leuven: Peeters, 1995.
- Alexandre, M. *Le commencement du livre Genèse 1–IV. La version grecque de la Septante et sa réception*, Christianisme antique 3. Paris: Beauchesne, 1988.
- Alexandre, M. 'Entre ciel et terre: les premiers débats sur le site du Paradis (Gen. 2, 8–15 et ses réceptions)' in F. Jouan–B. Deforge (eds.), *Peuples et pays mythiques. Actes du v^e Colloque du Centre de Recherches Mythologiques de l'Université de Paris X (Chantilly, 18–20 septembre 1986)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1988, 187–224.
- Alexandre, M. 'L'épée de flamme (*gen.* 3,24): textes chrétiens et traditions juives', in Caquot et al. (eds.), *Hellenica et Judaica*, 403–441.
- Alexandre, M. 'L'exégèse de Gen. 1,1–2a dans l'*In Hexaemeron* de Grégoire de Nysse: Deux approches du problème de la matière', in H. Dörrie (ed.), *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie*. Leiden: Brill, 1976, 159–186.
- Alpers, C. 'Ein Handschriftenfund zum Cyrill-Glossar in der Staats und Universitätsbibliothek Bremen', in W. Hörandner–E. Trapp (eds.), *Lexicographica Byzantina, Byzantina Vindobonensia* 20. Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991, 11–52.
- Alt, P.-A. 'Traditions and the Dynamics of Change: Preliminary Thoughts on a Key Issue in Early Modern Studies', in A.J. Johnston–M. Rouse–W. Schmidt-Biggemann (eds.), *Transforming Topoi. The Exigencies and Impositions of Tradition*, BMFF 23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018, 15–40.
- Amirav, H. *Rhetoric and Tradition: John Chrysostom on Noah and the Flood*, TEG 12. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Asensio, F. 'El Crisóstomo y su visión de la escritura', *Estudios Bíblicos* 32 (1973) 223–255; 329–356.
- Aspesi, C. 'Literacy and Book Ownership in the Congregations of John Chrysostom', *StPatr* 67 (2013) 333–344.
- Astruc-Morize, G.–A. Le Boulluec. 'Le sens caché des Écritures selon Origène et Jean Chrysostome', *StPatr* 25 (1993) 1–26.
- Astruc-Morize, G. 'Saint Jean Chrysostome, théologien, moraliste et mystique', in *Qu'ils*

- soient Un! *Mélanges offerts en hommage au métropolite Emilianos Timiadis*. Iasi: Trinitas, 2005, 64–76.
- Augustin, P.–J.-H. Sautel. *Codices chrysostomici graeci, VII: Codicum Parisinorum partem priorem*, DER 80. Paris: CNRS Editions, 2011.
- Ausloos, H.–B. Lemmelijn–V. Kabergs. 'The Study of Aetiological Wordplay as a Content-Related Criterion in the Characterisation of LXX Translation Technique', in S. Kreuzer–M. Meiser–M. Sigismund (eds.), *Die Septuaginta: Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte*, WUNT 286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012, 273–294.
- Ayres, L. 'Irenaeus vs. the Valentinians: Towards a Rethinking of Patristic Exegetical Origins', *J ECS* 23.2 (2015) 153–187.
- Ayres, L. *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.
- Ax, W. 'Sprache als Gegenstand der alexandrinischen und pergamenischen Philologie', in K. Döring–Th. Ebert (eds.), *Dialektiker und Stoiker. Zur Logik der Stoa und ihrer Vorläufer*. Stuttgart: Fr. Steiner, 1993, 11–32.
- Bady, G. '«Allons et discutons»: le dialogue avec le monde, entre exégèse et polémique, dans quelques écrits attribués à Jean Chrysostome', in Stavrou—van Rossum (dir.), *Écriture et tradition chez les Pères de l'Église*, 93–104.
- Bady, G. 'Les manuscrits grecs des œuvres de Jean Chrysostome d'après la base de données *Pinakes* et les *Codices Chrysostomici Graeci VII: Codicum Parisinorum pars prior*', *Eruditio antiqua* 4 (2012) 65–82.
- Bady, G. 'La tradition des œuvres de Jean Chrysostome, entre transmission et transformation', *RÉByz* 68 (2010) 149–163.
- Bandt, C.–F.X. Risch–B. Villani (eds.). *Die Prologtexte zu den Psalmen von Origenes und Eusebius*, TU 183. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2018.
- Bardy, G. 'La littérature patristique des «*quaestiones et responsiones*» sur l'Écriture sainte', *RB* 41 (1932) 210–236, 341–369, 515–537; 42 (1933) 14–30, 211–229, 328–352.
- de Barjau, J.P. *L'école exégétique d'Antioche*. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1898.
- Barnes, T.D. *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Cambridge, MA–London: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Barnes, T.D. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, MA–London: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Bartelink, G.J.M. '“Philosophie” et “philosophe” dans quelques œuvres de Jean Chrysostome', *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 25 (1949) 97–108.
- Bartelink, G.J.M. 'Observations de saint Basile sur la langue biblique et théologique', *vc* 17.2 (1963) 85–104.
- Barthélemy, D. 'Eusèbe, la Septante et «les autres»', in *La Bible et les Pères. Colloque de Strasbourg (1er–3 octobre 1969)*, BCESS. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1971, 51–65.
- Barthélemy, D. 'Origène et le texte de l'Ancient Testament', in Fontaine–Kannengiesser (eds.), *Epektasis*, 247–261.

- Barthélemy, D. 'La place de la Septante dans l'Église', *Recherches Biblique* 8 (1967) 13–28.
- Basset, L. 'Apollonius between Homeric and Hellenistic Greek: The Case of the "Pre-positive Article"', in S. Matthaios et al. (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar*, 251–268.
- Bate, H.N. 'Some Technical Terms of Greek Exegesis', *JThS* 24 (1923) 59–66.
- Baur, C. 'Chrysostomus in Genesim', *Theologische Quartalschrift* 108 (1927) 221–232.
- Baur, C. *Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, 2 vols. Munich: M. Huebner, 1929–1930.
- Bayliss, G. *The Vision of Didymus the Blind. A Fourth-Century Virtue-Origenism*, OTRM (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2015).
- Beeley, C. 'The Early Christological Controversy: Apollinarius, Diodore, and Gregory Nazianzen', *VC* 65.4 (2011) 376–407.
- Bennet, B. 'Didymus the Blind's Knowledge of Manichaeism' in P. Mirecki–J. BeDuhn (eds.), *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, NHMS 50. Leiden: Brill, 2001, 38–67.
- Bennet, B. 'Iuxta unum latus erat terra tenebrarum: The Division of Primordial Space in Anti-Manichaean Writers' Descriptions of the Manichaean Cosmogony', in P. Mirecki–J. BeDuhn (eds.), *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, NHMS 50. Leiden: Brill 2001, 68–78.
- Bergjan, S.-P.–S. Elm (eds.). *Antioch II. The Many Faces of Antioch: Intellectual Exchange and Religious Diversity*, CE 350–450, COMES 3. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- Bergjan, S.-P. 'Die dogmatische Funktionalisierung der Exegese nach Theodoret van Cyrus', in J. van Oort–U. Wickert (eds.), *Christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992, 32–48.
- Bergjan, S.-P. 'Konkurrenz unter den Nizänern. Die Christen Antiochiens im 4. Jahrhundert', in Bergjan–Elm (eds.), *Antioch II*, 383–420.
- Berglund, C.J. 'Interpreting Readers: The Role of Greco-Roman Education in Early Interpretation of New Testament Writings', in F. Wilk (ed.), *Scriptural Interpretation at the Interface between Education and Religion. In memory of Hans Conzelmann*, TBN 22. Leiden: Brill, 2018, 204–247.
- Bertram, G. 'Praeparatio Evangelica in der Septuaginta', *VT* 7 (1957) 225–249.
- Binder, G. 'Eine Polemik des Porphyrios gegen die allegorische Auslegung des Alten Testaments durch die Christen', *ZPE* 3 (1968) 81–96.
- Blank, D.L. 'Analogy, Anomaly and Apollonius Dyscolus', in S. Everson (ed.), *Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, 149–165.
- Blowers, P.M. *Drama of the Divine Economy: Creator and Creation in Early Christian Theology and Piety*, OECs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Blumenberg, H. *Ästhetische und metaphorologische Schriften*, A. Haverkamp (ed.). Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2001.
- Blumenberg, H. *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, R. Wallace (trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985.

- Bockmuehl, M. 'Locating Paradise', in M. Bockmuehl–G.G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010, 192–209.
- von Bonsdorff, M. *Zur Predigtstätigkeit des Johannes Chrysostomus, biographisch-chronologische Studien über seine Homilienserien zu neutestamentlichen Büchern*. Diss, Helsingfors, 1922.
- Le Boulluec, A. 'De l'unité du couple à union du Christ et de l'Église chez les exégètes chrétiens antiques', in P. Legendre (ed.), «*Ils seront deux en une seule chair*». *Scénographie du couple humain dans le texte occidental*. Bruxelles: Émile van Balbergue Libraire, 2004.
- Boulnois, M.-O. 'Le *Contre les Galiléens* de l'empereur Julien répond-il au *Contre Celse* d'Origène?', *RÉAug* supp. 3 (2014) 103–128.
- Boulnois, M.-O. 'Genèse 2–3: Mythe ou vérité? Un sujet de polémique entre païens et chrétiens dans le *Contre Julien* de Cyrille d'Alexandrie', *RÉAug* 54 (2008) 111–133.
- Boulnois, M.-O. 'Le souffle et l'Esprit. Exégèses patristiques de l'insufflation originelle de Gn 2, 7 en lien avec celle de Jn 20, 22', *Recherches Augustiniennes* 24 (1989) 3–37.
- Boutet, R. 'La métaphysique en dialogue: sur l'appropriation herméneutique de Platon par H.-G. Gadamer', *Archives de Philosophie* 77.3 (2014) 471–488.
- Bozinis, C.A. 'The Natural Law in John Chrysostom', in Mayer–de Wet (eds.), *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, 493–524.
- Bucur, B. *Scripture Re-envisioned: Christophanic Exegesis and the Making of a Christian Bible*, BAC 13. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Bultmann, R. *Die Exegese des Theodor von Mopsuestia*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984².
- Bussières, M.-P. (ed.). *La littérature des questions et réponses dans l'Antiquité profane et chrétienne*, IPM 64. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.
- Brändle, R. *Matthäus 25,31–46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostoms. Ein Beitrag zur Auslegungsgeschichte und zur Erforschung der Ethik der griechischen Kirche um die Wende vom 4. Zum 5. Jahrhundert*, BGBE 22. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979.
- Brändle, R. 'Zur Interpretation von Mt 25,31–36 im Matthäuskommentar des Origenes', *ThZ* 36 (1980) 17–25.
- Breck, J. 'Théôria antiochienne et eschatologie «holistique»', in Stavrou–Van Rossum (dir.), *Écriture et tradition chez les Pères de l'église*, 49–62.
- Broc-Schmezer, C. 'Théologie et philosophie en prédication: le cas de Jean Chrysostome', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 97 (2013) 187–212.
- Brock, S.P. 'Genesis 22 in Syriac Tradition', in P. Casetti–O. Keel–A. Schenker (eds.), *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy. Études Bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60^e anniversaire*, OBO 38. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981, 1–30.
- Brock, S.P. 'The Resolution of the Philoxonian/Harklean Problem', in E.J. Epp–G.D. Fee (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism. Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honor of Bruce M. Metzger*. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press, 1981, 325–343.

- Brock, S.P. 'The Robe of Glory: A Biblical Image in the Syriac Tradition', *The Way* 39.3 (1999) 247–259.
- Brottier, L. *L'appel des «demi-chrétiens» à la «vie angélique». Jean Chrysostome prédicateur: entre idéal monastique et réalité mondaine*, Patrimoines Christianisme. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2005.
- Brottier, L. 'Sur quelques définitions de πνευματικός chez Jean Chrysostome', *REAug* 38 (1992) 19–28.
- Byron, J. *Cain and Abel in Text and Tradition. Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the First Sibling Rivalry*, Themes in Biblical Narrative 14. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Canévet, M. *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique. Étude des rapports entre le langage et la connaissance de Dieu*, EAA 99. Turnhout: Brepols, 1983.
- Caquot, A.–M. Hadas-Lebel–J. Riaud (eds.). *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky*. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.
- Carter, R. 'The Chronology of Twenty Homilies of Severian of Gabala', *Traditio* 55 (2000) 1–17.
- Cavarnos, J.P. 'Relation of the Body and Soul in the Thought of Gregory of Nyssa', in H. Dörrie–M. Altenburger–U. Schramm (eds.), *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie: Zweites internationales Kolloquium über Gregor von Nyssa*. Leiden: Brill, 1976, 61–74.
- Ceulemans, R. 'Readings Attributed to "οἱ περὶ α' and/or σ'" by Theodoret of Cyrrhus', in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Helsinki, 2010*, SOS 59. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013, 473–498.
- Ceulemans, R. 'Readings Attributed to "οἱ περὶ (τὸν) Ἀκύλαν and/or (τὸν) Σύμμαχον" by Greek Christian Scribes and Authors', *Semitica et Classica* 4 (2011) 73–88.
- Chase, F.H. *Chrysostom: A Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, & Co., 1887.
- Chin, C.M. *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World*, Divinations. Philadelphia, PA: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Chin, C.M. 'Origen and Christian Naming: Textual Exhaustion and the Boundaries of Gentility in Commentary on John 1', *J ECS* 14.4 (2006) 407–436.
- Clark, E.A. *Jerome, Chrysostom, and Friends. Essays and Translations*. New York–Toronto, 1979.
- Clark, E.A. *The Origenist Controversy. The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014².
- Cook, J.D. *Preaching and Popular Christianity. Reading the Sermons of John Chrysostom*, OTRM. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Cook, J.G. *The Interpretation of the Old Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*, STAC 23. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Cook, J.G. 'Porphyry's Critique of the Jewish Scriptures: Three New Fragments', in S. Kreuzer–M. Meiser–M. Sigismund (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Entstehung, Sprache,*

- Geschichte. 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 22.–25. Juli 2010*, WUNT 286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012, 561–581.
- Collins, C.J. 'Noah, Deucalion, and the New Testament', *Biblica* 93 (2012) 403–426.
- Collins, J.J. *The Scepter and the Star. The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature*, Anchor Bible Reference. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- Congar, Y. 'Le thème de Dieu-Créateur et les explications de l'Hexaemeron dans la tradition chrétienne', in *L'Homme devant Dieu. Mélanges offerts au Père Henri de Lubac*, Théologie 56. Paris: Aubier, 1963, 215–222.
- Costache, D. 'Revisiting the Date of John Chrysostom's Homilies on Genesis', *JThS* 68.2 (2017) 621–624.
- Courcelle, P. 'Critiques exégétiques et arguments antichrétiens rapportés par Ambrosiaster', *VC* 13.3 (1959) 133–169.
- Crawford, M. *The Eusebian Canon Tables. Ordering Textual Knowledge in Late Antiquity*, OECs. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Crépey, C. 'Les Homélies sur la Genèse de Jean Chrysostome: unité de la série, chronologie de la succession, provenance et datation', *REAug* 55.1 (2009) 73–112.
- Cribiore, R. 'Why Did Christians Compete with Pagans for Greek *Paideia*?' in K.M. Hogan–M. Goff–E. Wassermann (eds.), *Pedagogy in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Early Judaism and its Literature 41. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2017, 359–374.
- Crouzel, H.–M. Simonetti. *Origène: Traité des Principes, livres I–II; III–IV. Commentaire*, SC 253; 269. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978, 1980.
- Cunningham, M.B. 'Dramatic Device or Rhetorical Tool? The Function of Dialogue in Byzantine Preaching', in E. Jeffreys (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium. Papers from the Thirty-Fifth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Exeter College, University of Oxford, March 2001* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2003), 101–113.
- Curti, C. 'L'esegesi di Eusebio di Cesarea: caratteri e sviluppo', in *Le trasformazioni della cultura nella Tarda Antichità. Atti del Convengno tenuto a Catania, Università degli Studi, 27 Sett.–2 Ott. 1982*, vol. 1. Rome: Jouvence, 1985, 459–478.
- Daniélou, J. *Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne (Les Testimonia)*, ThHist. Paris: Beauchesne, 1966.
- Daniélou, J. *Sacramentum futuri. Études sur les origines de la typologie biblique*, ThHist. Paris: Beauchesne, 1997².
- DelCogliano, M. 'Basil of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind, and the Anti-Pneumatomachian Exegesis of Amos 4:13 and John 1:3', *JThS* 61.2 (2010) 644–658.
- DelCogliano, M. 'Basil of Caesarea versus Eunomius of Cyzicus on the Nature of Time: A Patristic Reception of the Critique of Plato', *VC* 68.5 (2014) 498–532.
- DelCogliano, M. 'Basil of Caesarea on Proverbs 8:22 and the Sources of Pro-Nicene Theology', *JThS* 59.1 (2008) 183–190.

- DelCogliano, M. 'Eusebian Theologies of the Son as the Image of God before 341', *JECs* 14.4 (2006) 459–484.
- DelCogliano, M. 'The Literary Corpus of George of Laodicea', *VC* 65.2 (2011) 150–169.
- DeMarco, D.C. 'The Presentation and Reception of Basil's *Homiliae in Hexaemeron* in Gregory's *In Hexaemeron*', *ZAC* 17.2 (2013) 332–352.
- Desbordes, F. 'Homonymie et synonymie d'après les textes théoriques latins' in G. Clerico–B. Colombat–J. Soubiran (eds.), *Idées grecques et romaines sur le langage. Traavaux d'histoire et d'épistémologie*. Lyon: ENS Éditions, 2007, 307–357.
- Devreesse, R. *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*, ST 141. Vatican City, Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana 1948.
- Dorival, G. 'Le sens de l'écriture chez les Pères grecs', *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* 12 (1992) 426–442.
- Dorival, G. 'Le patriarche Héber et la tour de Babel: un apocryphe disparu?' in A. Frey–R. Gounelle (eds.), *Poussières de christianisme et de judaïsme antiques: Études réunies en l'honneur de Jean-Daniel Kestli et Éric Junod*, IRSB 5. Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2007, 181–201.
- Dorival, G. 'La posterité littéraire des chaînes exégétiques grecques', *RÉByz* 43 (1985) 209–226.
- Dorival, G. 'La *Protheôria* de la Synopse de Jean Chrysostome', *ThZ* 62 (2006), 222–247.
- Dorival, G. 'Remarques sur les *Eklogai prophétiques* d'Eusèbe de Césarée', in B. Janssens–B. Roosen–P. Van Deun (eds.), *Philomathestatos. Studies in Greek and Byzantine Texts Presented to Jacques Noret for his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, OLA 137. Leuven: Peeters, 2004, 203–224.
- Dörrie, H. 'Präpositionen und Metaphysik: Wechselwirkung zweier Prinzipienreihen', *Museum Helveticum* 26.4 (1969) 217–228.
- Drachmann, A.B. *Überlieferung des Cyrillglossars*, HfM 21/5. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard, 1936.
- Drecoll, V.H. *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea: sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner*, FKDG 66. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Drecoll, V.H. 'How Binitarian/Trinitarian was Eusebius?', in Johnson–Schott (eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea*, 289–305.
- Drewery, B. 'Antiochien II. Die Bedeutung Antiochiens in der alten Kirche', *TRE* 3 (1978), 103–111.
- Drobner, H.R. 'Die Deutung des alttestamentlichen Pascha (*Ex* 12) bei Gregor von Nyssa im Lichte der Auslegungstradition der griechischen Kirche', in H.R. Drobner–Ch. Klock (eds.), *Studien zur Gregor von Nyssa und der christlichen Spätantike*, SVC 12. Leiden: Brill, 1989, 273–296.
- Druet, F.-X. *Langage, images et visages de la mort chez Jean Chrysostome*, CEC 3. Namur: Presses universitaires de Namur, 1990.
- Dyck, A.R. 'The Glossographoi', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 91 (1987) 119–160.

- El-Khoury, N. 'Hermeneutics in the Works of Ephraim the Syrian', *OCA* 229 (1987) 93–100.
- Elliott, M. *The Heart of Biblical Theology. Providence Experienced*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.
- Elliott, M. 'Wisdom of Solomon, Canon and Authority', in *StPatr* 63 (2013) 3–16.
- Ermoni, V. 'Diodore de Tarse et son rôle doctrinal', *Le Muséon* 20 (1901) 422–444.
- Esdall, B.A. 'Chrysostom's Use of Origen: Interpreting 1 Corinthians 4:6, Gospel Proof-Texts, and a Case for Direct Dependence', *JThS* 70.1 (2019) 239–250.
- Eskhult, J. 'The Primeval Language and Hebrew Ethnicity in Ancient Jewish and Christian Thought until Augustine', *RÉAug* 60.2 (2014) 291–347.
- Evans, R. *Reception History, Tradition and Biblical Interpretation: Gadamer and Jauss*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Fabbi, F. 'La «condiscendenza» divina nell'ispirazione biblica secondo s. Giovanni Crisostomo', *Biblica* 14 (1933) 330–347.
- Falcetta, A. 'The Testimony Research of James Rendel Harris', *NovT* 45.3 (2003) 280–299.
- Féghali, P. 'Influence des Targums sur la pensée exégétique d'Ephrem?', *OCA* 229 (1984) 71–82.
- Ferraro, G. *Lo Spirito Santo nel Quarto Vangelo: i commenti di Origene, Giovanni Crisostomo, Teodoro di Mopsuestia e Cirillo di Alessandria*, *OCA* 246. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995.
- Fontaine, J.–Ch. Kannengiesser (eds.). *Epektasis. Mélanges patristiques offerts au cardinal Jean Daniélou*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972.
- Förster, Th. *Chrysostomus in seinem Verhältnis zur Antiochenischen Schule. Ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte*. Gotha: Perthes, 1869.
- Frishman, J.–L. Van Rompay (eds.), *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation*, *TEG* 5. Leuven: Peeters, 1997, 103–123.
- Fruchon, P. 'Exégèse biblique et tradition', *Esprit* 366 (1967) 883–897.
- Fürst, A. *Von Origenes und Hieronymus zu Augustinus. Studien zur antiken Theologiegeschichte*, *AK* 115. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- Gadamer, H.-G. *Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990.
- Gallagher, E.L. *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory. Canon, Language, Text*, *svc* 114. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Geiger, M.-E. *Les homélies de Jean Chrysostome In principium Actorum (CPG 4371): projet d'édition critique, traduction et commentaire*, 2 vols., diss. Université Lumière Lyon 2, 2018.
- Gillard, G.V. 'God in Gen. 1:26 according to Chrysostom', *Studia Biblica* 1 (1978) 149–156.
- Giulea, D.A. 'Basil of Caesarea's Authorship of *Epistle* 361 and His Relationship with the Homoiousians Reconsidered', *vc* 72.1 (2018) 41–70.
- Glenthøj, J.B. *Cain and Abel in Syriac and Greek Writers (4th–6th centuries)*, *cscO* 567. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.

- Glück, M. *Priscians Partitiones und ihre Stellung in der spätantiken Schule*, Spudasmata 12. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1967.
- Gorday, P. *Principles of Patristic Exegesis: Romans 9–11 in Origen, John Chrysostom, and Augustine*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 4. New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1983.
- Goulet, R. 'Cinq nouveaux fragments nominaux du traité de Porphyry "Contre les chrétiens"', VC 64.2 (2010) 140–159.
- Goulon, A. 'Quelques aspects du symbolisme de l'abeille et du miel à l'époque patristique', in L. Holtz–J.-C. Fredouille (eds.), *De Tertullien aux mozarabes. Mélanges offerts à Jacques Fontaine à l'occasion de son 70^e anniversaire*, EAA 132. Turnhout: Brepols, 1992, 525–535.
- Gounelle, R. '«Il a placé sa tente dans le soleil» chez les écrivains ecclésiastiques des cinq premiers siècles', in *Le psautier chez les Pères*, CBP 4. Strasburg: Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation patristiques, 1994, 197–220.
- Grabbe, L.L. *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation. The Hebrew Names in Philo*, Brown Judaic Studies 115. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Gräfenhan, A. *Geschichte der Klassischen Philologie im Altertum*, vol. 111. Bonn: H.B. König, 1846.
- Grafton, A.–M. Williams. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book. Origen, Eusebius and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Grant, R.M. 'The Stromateis of Origen', in Fontaine–Kannengiesser (eds.), *Epektasis*, 285–292.
- Greer, R.A. 'The Antiochene Christology of Diodore of Tarsus', *JThS* 17.2 (1966) 327–341.
- Griffith, S. 'Syriac/Antiochene Exegesis in Saint Ephrem's Teaching Songs De Paradiso: The "Types of Paradise" in the "Treasury of Revelations"', in R.D. Miller (ed.), *Syriac and Antiochian Exegesis and Biblical Theology for the 3rd Millennium*, Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 6. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008, 27–52.
- Grillmeier, A.–H. Bacht. *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart. Im Auftrage der Theologischen Fakultät*, 2 vols. Würzburg: Echterverlag, 1951–1953.
- Grypeou, E.–H. Spurling. 'Abraham's Angels: Jewish and Christian Exegesis of Genesis 18–19,' in E. Grypeou–H. Spurling (eds.), *The Exegetical Encounter between Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity*, JCPS 18. Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2009, 181–212.
- Grypeou, E.–H. Spurling. *The Book of Genesis in Late Antiquity: Encounters Between Jewish and Christian Exegetes*, JCPS 24. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Grypeou, E. 'Ephraem Graecus, 'Sermo in Adventum Domini'. A Contribution to the Study of the Transmission of Apocalyptic Motifs in Greek, Latin and Syriac Traditions in Late Antiquity', in S.K. Samir–J.P. Monferrer-Sala (eds.), *Greco-Latina et Orientalia. Studia in honorem Angeli Urbani heptagenarii*, CNERU 2. Beyrouth–Cordoba, Oriens Academic: 2013, 165–179.
- Gudemann, A. 'Λύσεις', RE 13.2 (1927) 2511–2529.

- Guillaumont, A. 'Genèse 1, 1–2 selon les commentateurs syriaques', in *In Principio. Interprétations des premiers versets de la Genèse*, EAA 38. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1973, 115–132.
- Guillet, J. 'Les Exégèses d'Alexandrie et d'Antioche. Conflit ou Malentendu?', *RSR* 34.3 (1947) 257–302.
- Guinot, J.-N. 'La cristallisation d'un différend: Zorobabel dans l'exégèse de Théodore de Mopsueste et de Théodoret de Cyr', *Augustinianum* 24 (1984) 527–547.
- Guinot, J.-N. 'L'école exégétique d'Antioche et ses relations avec Origène', in L. Perrone (ed.), *Origeniana Octava. Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition*, vol. II, BETL 164b. Leuven: Peeters, 2003, 1149–1166.
- Guinot, J.-N. 'Un évêque exégète: Théodoret de Cyr', in C. Mondésert (dir.), *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible*, BT 1. Paris: Beauchesne, 1984, 335–360.
- Guinot, J.-N. 'L'exégèse allégorique d'Homer et celle de la Bible sont-elles également légitimes?', *Auctores Nostri* 2 (2005) 91–114.
- Guinot, J.-N. *L'exégèse de Théodoret de Cyr*, ThHist 100. Paris: Beauchesne, 1995.
- Guinot, J.-N. 'L'exégèse figurative de la Bible chez les Pères de l'Eglise', *Revue sémiotique et bible* 123 (2006) 5–26.
- Guinot, J.-N. 'La fortune des *Hexaples* d'Origène aux iv^e et v^e siècles en milieu antiochien', in Alexandre et al. (eds.), *Origeniana Sexta*, 243–254.
- Guinot, J.-N. 'La frontière entre allégorie et typologie. École alexandrine, école antiochienne', *RSR* 99.2 (2011) 207–228.
- Guinot, J.-N. 'Muthos et récit biblique chez Origène. Un danger d'ambiguïté', in G. Heidl–R. Somos (eds.), *Origeniana Nona: Origen and the Religious Practice of his Time. Papers of the 9th International Origen Congress. Pécs, Hungary, 29 August–2 September 2005*, BETL 228. Leuven: Peeters, 2009, 179–193.
- Guinot, J.-N. 'Théodoret a-t-il lu les homélies d'Origène sur l'Ancien Testament?' *Vetera Christianorum* 21 (1984) 285–312.
- Guinot, J.-N. 'Théodoret et le millénarisme d'Apollinaire', *ASE* 15 (1998) 153–180.
- Guinot, J.-N. 'Théodoret imitateur d'Eusèbe: l'exégèse de la prophétie des 'soixante-dix semaines' (*Dan.* 9, 24–27)', *Orpheus* 8.2 (1987) 283–309.
- Guinot, J.-N. 'La typologie comme système herméneutique', in *Figures de l'Ancien Testament chez les Pères*, CBP 2. Strasbourg: Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation patristiques, 1989, 1–34.
- Guinot, J.-N. 'Les *Questions sur l'Octateuque et les Règles* de Théodoret de Cyr: œuvre originale ou simple compilation?', in Bussièrès (ed.), *La littérature*, 177–214.
- Hadot, P. 'Théologie, exégèse, révélation, écriture dans la philosophie grecque', in M. Tardieu (ed.), *Les règles de l'interprétation*, Patrimoines. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1987, 13–34.
- Halperin, D. *The Faces of the Chariot*, TSAJ 16. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988.
- Hanson, R.P.C. 'Interpretations of Hebrew Names in Origen', *VC* 10.2 (1956) 103–123.

- Harl, M.–G. Dorival–O. Munnich. *La bible grecque des Septante*, Initiations au christianisme ancien. Paris: Éditions du Cerf—Éditions du CNRS, 1988.
- Harl, H. 'La «ligature» d'Isaac (*Gen.* 22,9) dans la Septante et chez les pères grecs', in Caquot et al. (eds.) *Hellenica et Judaica*, 457–472.
- Harl, H. *La langue de Japhet. Quinze études sur la Septante et le grec des chrétiens*, Centre Lenain de Tillemont. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992.
- Harl, H. *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du Verbe incarné*, Patristica Sorbonensia 2. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1958.
- Harl, H. 'Origène et la sémantique du langage biblique', *VC* 26 (1972) 161–187.
- Harl, H. 'Origène et les interprétations patristiques grecques de l'«obscurité» biblique', *VC* 36 (1982) 334–371.
- Harl, H. 'Les origines grecques du mot et de la notion de «componction» dans la Septante et chez ses commentateurs (KATANUSSESTHAI)', *REA* 32 (1986) 3–21.
- Harris, J.R. *Testimonies*, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916–1920.
- Harrison, N.V. 'Women and the Image of God according to St. John Chrysostom', in P. Blowers–A.R. Christman–D.G. Hunter (eds.), *In Dominico Eloquentia—In Lordly Eloquence: Essays on Patristic Exegesis in Honor of Robert Louis Wilken*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002, 259–279.
- Harrison, N.V. 'Women, Human Identity, and the Image of God: Antiochene Interpretations', *J ECS* 9.2 (2001) 205–249.
- Hatch, E. *Essays in Biblical Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889.
- Hawkins, S. 'Theory of a Practice: A foundation for Blumenberg's metaphorology in Ricœur's theory of Metaphor', *Thesis Eleven* 155.1 (2019) 72–86.
- Haykin, M.A.G. 'And who is the Spirit? Basil of Caesarea's Letters to the Church at Tarsus', *VC* 41.4 (1987) 377–385.
- Hayward, C.T.R. *Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis*, OECs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Heath, M. 'John Chrysostom, Rhetoric, and Galatians', *Biblical Interpretation* 12.4 (2004) 369–400.
- Heine, R.E. 'Gregory of Nyssa's Apology for Allegory', *VC* 38.4 (1984) 360–370.
- Hengsber, W. *De ornatu rhetorico quem Basilius Magnus diversis homiliarum generibus adhibuit*. Bonn University diss., 1957.
- Henrichs, A. 'Scholia minora zu Homer I–IV', *ZPE* 7 (1971) 97–149; 229–260; 8 (1971) 1–12; 12 (1973) 17–43.
- Hergenröther, Ph. *Die antiochenische Schule und ihre Bedeutung auf exegetischem Gebiete*. Würzburg: Stahel, 1866.
- Hidal, S. 'Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Antiochene School with its Prevalent Literal and Historical Method', in M. Sæbø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament*, 543–568.
- Hidal, S. *Interpretatio Syriaca. Die Kommentare des Heiligen Ephräm des Syrers zu Gene-*

- sis und Exodus mit besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer auslegungsgeschichtlichen Stellung*, Coniectanea biblica 6. Lund: Gleerup, 1974.
- Hihn, O. 'The Election and Deposition of Meletius of Antioch: The Fall of an Integrative Bishop', in J. Leemans–P. Van Nuffelen–S.W.J. Keough–C. Nicolaye (eds.), *Episcopal Elections in Late Antiquity*, AK 119. Berlin–Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2011, 357–374.
- Hill, R.C. 'Chrysostom as Old Testament Commentator', *Prudentia* 20.1 (1988) 44–56.
- Hill, R.C. 'Chrysostom on the Obscurity of the Old Testament', *OCA* 67.2 (2001) 371–383.
- Hill, R.C. *Reading the Old Testament in Antioch*, BAC 5. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Hintenland, H. *Untersuchungen zu den Homer-aporien des Aristoteles*. Diss. Heidelberg, 1961.
- Hofer, A. *Christ in the Life and Teaching of Gregory of Nazianzus*, OECS. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Holman, S.R. *The Hungry are Dying. Beggars and Bishops in Roman Cappadocia*, OSHT. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Hollerich, M.J. 'Eusebius as Polemical Interpreter of Scripture', in W.H. Attridge–G. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, Studia Post Biblica 42. Leiden: Brill, 1992, 585–615.
- Hollerich, M.J. 'Eusebius' *Commentary on the Psalms* and its Place in the Origins of Christian Biblical Scholarship', in Johnson–Schott (eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea*, 151–167.
- Hollerich, M.J. *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah*, OECS. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Horbury, W. 'Old Testament Interpretation in the Writings of the Church Fathers', in J. Mulder–H. Sysling (eds.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*. Assen–Philadelphia, PA: Van Gorcum–Fortress, 1988, 727–787.
- van der Horst, P.W. 'The Pagan Opponents of Christianity on the Book of Genesis', *VC* 72.3 (2018) 318–336.
- Hunt, H. '"Clothed in the Body": The Garment of Flesh and the Garment of Glory in Syrian Religious Anthropology', *StPatr* 54 (2012) 167–176.
- Inglebert, H. *Interpretatio Christiana. Les mutations des savoirs (cosmographie, géographie, ethnographie, histoire) dans l'Antiquité chrétienne (30–630 après J.-C.)*, EAA 166. Turnhout: Brepols, 2001.
- Inowlocki, S.–C. Zamagni (eds.). *Reconsidering Eusebius. Collected Papers on Literary, Historical, and Theological Issues*, SVC 107. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Inowlocki, S. *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors. His Citation Technique in an Apologetic Context*, AJC 64. Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Jacobs, A. 'Epiphanius of Salamis and the Antiquarian's Bible', *J ECS* 21.3 (2013) 437–464.
- Jacobsen, A.L. 'Genesis 1–3 as Source for the Anthropology of Origen', *VC* 62.3 (2008) 213–232.

- Jansma, T. "And the Spirit of God Moved upon the Face of the Waters". Some Remarks on the Syro-Hexaplaric Reading of Gen. 1 2', *VT* 20 (1970) 16–24.
- Jansma, T. 'Investigations in the Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis. An Approach to the Exegesis of the Nestorian Church and the to the Comparison of Nestorian and Jewish Exegesis', *OtSt* 12 (1958) 69–181.
- Jauß, J. *Aesthetische Erfahrung und literarische Hermeneutik*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1982.
- Jauß, J. *Literatur in Alterität und Modernität der Mittelalterlichen Literatur: Gesammelte Aufsätze, 1956–1976*. München: Fink, 1977.
- Jauß, J. 'Tradition, Innovation, and Aesthetic Experience', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 46.3 (1988) 375–388.
- Jenkins, C. 'The Origen-Citations in Cramer's Catena on 1 Corinthians', *JThS* 6 (1904) 113–116.
- Johnson, A.P.–J. Schott. *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*, HS 60. Cambridge, MA: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2013.
- Johnson, A.P. 'The Ends of Transfiguration: Eusebius' Commentary on Luke (PG 24.549)', in Johnson–Schott (eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea*, 189–205.
- de Jonge, C. 'Grammatical Theory and Rhetorical Teaching', in Montanari et al. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Scholarship*, 981–1011.
- Jordan, H. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1911.
- Kalantzis, G. 'Creatio ex Terrae: Immortality and the Fall in Theodore, Chrysostom, and Theodoret', *StPatr* 67 (2013) 403–413.
- Kamesar, A. *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*, Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Kamesar, A. 'The Evaluation of the Narrative Aggada in Greek and Latin Patristic Literature', *JThS* 45.1 (1994) 37–71.
- Kannengiesser, Ch. *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, vol. 1, BAC 1. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Karmann, T.R. 'Johannes Chrysostomus und der Neunizänismus: Eine Spurensuche in ausgewählten Predigten des antiochenischen Presbyters', *SE* 51 (2012) 79–107.
- Karmann, T.R. *Meletius von Antiochien. Studien zur Geschichte des trinitätstheologischen Streits in den Jahren 360–364 n. Chr.*, Regensburger Studien zur Theologie 68. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2009.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *Golden Mouth. The Story of John Chrysostom, Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*. London: Duckworth, 1995.
- Kihn, H. *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus als Exegeten*. Freiburg: Herder, 1880.
- Kim, S. '«Je suis venu jeter du feu sur la terre»: l'édition critique de l'original grec et de la version arménienne d'une homélie du Pseudo-Chrysostome cappadocien (CPG 4669)', *SE* 57 (2018) 117–166.
- Köckert, Ch. *Christliche Kosmologie und kaiserzeitliche Philosophie: die Auslegung des*

- Schöpfungsberichtes bei Origenes, Basilius und Gregor von Nyssa vor dem Hintergrund kaiserzeitlicher Timaeus-Interpretationen*, STAC 56. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Kofsky, A.–S. Ruzer. 'Ephrem on Justice, Free Will, Divine Mercy in the Story of the Fall', in A. Kofsky–S. Ruzer (eds.), *Syriac Idiosyncrasies. Theology and Hermeneutics in Early Syriac Literature*, JSRC 11. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Kofsky, A.–S. Ruzer. 'Shaping Christology in a Hermeneutical Context: Theodore of Mopsuestia's Endeavor in Face of Contemporaneous Challenges', *Adamantius* 19 (2013) 256–275.
- Kofsky, A. *Eusebius of Caesarea Against Paganism*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Kolbet, P.R. 'Athanasius, the Psalms, and the Reformation of the Self', *HTR* 99.1 (2006) 85–101.
- Kremer, T. *Mundus Primus. Die Geschichte der Welt und des Menschen von Adam bis Noach im Genesiskommentar Ephräms des Syrers*, CSCO 641. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.
- Kronholm, T. *Motifs from Genesis 1–11 in the Genuine Hymns of Ephrem the Syrian with Particular Reference to the Influence of Jewish Exegetical Tradition*, Coniectanea biblica 11. Lund: Gleerup, 1978.
- Lai, P.-W. 'The Eusebian and Meletian Roots of John Chrysostom's Trinitarian Theology', *Scrinium* 14.1 (2018) 37–62.
- Lai, P.-W. 'The *Imago Dei* and Salvation among the Antiochenes: A Comparison of John Chrysostom with Theodore of Mopsuestia', *StPatr* 67 (2013) 393–402.
- Laird, M. *Gregory of Nyssa and the Grasp of Faith: Union, Knowledge and Divine Presence*, OECs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lamb, W. *The Catena in Marcum. A Byzantine Anthology of Early Commentary on Mark* (ed.-trans.), TENTS 6. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Lambden, S.N. 'From Fig Leaves to Fingernails: Some Notes on the Garments of Adam and Eve in the Hebrew Bible and Select Early Post-biblical Jewish Writings', in P. Morris–D. Sawyer (eds.), *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical, and Literary Images of Eden*, JSOTSup 136. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992, 74–90.
- Lamberton, J. *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*, TCH 9. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986.
- Larcher, C. *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou la Sagesse de Salomon*, vol. III. Paris: Gabalda, 1985.
- Laurin, J.R. *Orientations maîtresses des apologistes chrétiens de 270 à 361*. Analecta Gregoriana 61. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1954.
- Lausberg, L. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, trans. D.E. Orton–R.D. Anderson. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Layton, R.A. *Didymus the Blind and His Circle in Late-Antique Alexandria. Virtue and Narrative in Biblical Scholarship*. Campaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2004.
- Layton, R.A. 'Moses the Pedagogue: Procopius, Philo, and Didymus on the Pedagogy

- of the Creation', in L. Jenott–S.K. Gribetz (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Cosmogony in Late Antiquity*, TSAJ 155. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013, 167–192.
- Leconte, R. 'L'asceterium de Diodore', in *Mélanges biblique rédigées en l'honneur de André Robert*, Travaux de l'Institut catholique de Paris 4. Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1957, 531–536.
- Leemans, J. 'Athanasius and the Book of Wisdom', *ETL* 73.4 (1997) 349–368.
- Leemans, J. 'Reading Acts 6–7 in the Early Church: Gregory of Nyssa's First and Second Homilies on Stephen the Protomartyr', *StPatr* 47.4 (2010) 9–19.
- Lehmann, H. 'Evidence of the Syriac Bible Translation of the Old Testament—as Evidenced around the Middle of the Fourth Century (in Eusebius of Emesa)', *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 1 (1987) 66–86.
- Di Lella, A.A. 'The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel', in J.J. Collins–P.W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, vol. 2, VTSup 83. Leiden: Brill, 2001, 586–607.
- Léonas, A. *Recherches sur le langage de la Septante*, OBO 211. Friburg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2005.
- Leroux, J.-M. 'Relativité et transcendance du texte biblique d'après Jean Chrysostome', in *La Bible et les Pères. Colloque de Strasbourg (1–3 octobre 1969)*, BCESS. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1971, 67–78.
- Léroy, F.J. 'Les manuscrits de Montfaucon et l'Édition de s. Jean Chrysostome: notes sur quelques manuscrits du supplément grec, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris', *Traditio* 20 (1964) 411–418.
- Lettieri, G. 'Dies una. L'allegoria di «coelum et terra in Principio» ricapitolazione del sistema mistico-speculativo di Origene', *Adamantius* 23 (2017) 45–84.
- Leyerle, B. *The Narrative Shape of Emotion in the Preaching of John Chrysostom*, CLA 10. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2020.
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. *Ambrose and John Chrysostom. Clerics Between Desert and Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. *East and West in Late Antiquity. Invasion, Settlement, Ethnogenesis and Conflicts of Religion*, Impact of Empire 20. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. 'How God Made the World in Seven Days: The Commentaries on Genesis of John Chrysostom (Homilies 1–12) and of Eusebius of Emesa (1–10), Two Distinct Representatives of the School of Antioch', *Antiquité tardive* 22 (2014) 243–253.
- Lienhard, J.T. 'The Exegesis of 1 Cor 15, 24–28 from Marcellus of Ancyra to Theodoret of Cyrus', *VC* 37.4 (1983) 340–359.
- Lim, R. 'The Politics of Interpretation in Basil of Caesarea's Hexaemeron', *VC* 44 (1990) 351–370.
- Lim, R. *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*, TCH 23. Berkeley, CA–London: University of California Press, 1995.

- Lössl, J. 'A Shift in Patristic Exegesis: Hebrew Clarity and Historical Verity in Augustine, Jerome and Theodore of Mopsuestia', *Augustinian Studies* 33.2 (2001) 157–175.
- Lössl, J. 'When is a Locust just a Locust? Patristic Exegesis of Joel 1:4 in the Light of Ancient Literary Theory', *JThS* 55.2 (2004) 575–599.
- de Lubac, H. *Histoire et esprit. L'intelligence de l'écriture d'après Origène*, Théologie 16. Paris: Aubier, 1950.
- Lust, J. *Messianism and the Septuagint. Collected Essays*, BETL 178. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.
- Malavasi, G. 'Diodore of Tarsus' Treatise Against the Manichaeans: A New Fragment', *VC* 69.3 (2015) 296–304.
- Mansfeld, J. *Prolegomena. Questions to be Settled Before the Study of an Author, or a Text*, *Philosophia Antiqua* 61. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Marcus, R. 'An Armenian-Greek Index to Philo's *Quaestiones* and *De Vita Contemplativa*', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 53.3 (1933) 251–282.
- Mariès, L. *Études préliminaires à l'édition du Commentaire de Diodore de Tarse sur les Psaumes*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1933.
- Markowicz, W.A. 'Chrysostom's Sermons on Genesis: A Problem', *JThS* 24 (1963) 652–664.
- Markowicz, W.A. *The Text Tradition of St. John Chrysostom's Homilies on Genesis and Mss. Michiganensis 139, 78 and Holkhamicus 61*. Diss. University of Michigan, 1953.
- Markschies, Ch. 'Scholien bei Origenes und in der zeitgenössischen wissenschaftlichen Kommentierung', in S. Kaczamerk–H. Pietras (eds.), *Origen as Writer. Papers of the 10th International Origen Congress, University of Philosophy and Education "Ignatianum", Kraków, Poland. 31 August–4 September 2009*, BETL 244. Leuven: Peeters, 2011, 147–167.
- Marrou, H.-I. *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1948.
- Martens, P.W. *Origen and Scripture: The Contours of the Exegetical Life*, OECs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Martens, P.W. 'Revisiting the Allegory/Typology Distinction: The Case of Origen', *JECs* 16.3 (2008) 283–317.
- Matthaios, S.–F. Montanari–A. Rengakos (eds.). *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar: Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*, TCSV 8. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- Matthaios, S. 'Greek Scholarship in the Imperial Era and Late Antiquity', in Montanari et al. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Scholarship*, 193–202.
- Matthaios, S. *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs. Texte und Interpretation zur Wortartenlehre*, Hypomnemata 126. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
- Maxwell, J.L. *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and His Congregation in Antioch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- May, G. *Schöpfung aus dem Nichts. Die Entstehung der Lehre von der Creatio ex nihilo*, AK 48. Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.

- Mayer, W.–C.L. de Wet (eds.). *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*, CAEC 1. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Mayer, W. 'Les homélies de Jean Chrysostome: problèmes concernant la provenance, l'ordre et la datation', *RÉAug* 52 (2006) 329–353.
- Mayer, W. *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom. Provenance: Reshaping the Foundations*, OCA 273. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2005.
- Mayer, W. 'John Chrysostom: Extraordinary Preacher, Ordinary Audience', in M.B. Cunningham–P. Allen (eds.), *Preacher and his Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics, A New History of the Sermon* 1. Leiden: Brill, 1998, 105–138.
- Mayer, W. 'John Chrysostom on Poverty', in P. Allen–W. Mayer–B. Neil (eds.), *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity. Perceptions and Realities*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2009, 69–118.
- Mayer, W. 'The Sequence and Provenance of John Chrysostom's homilies *In illud: Si esurierit inimicus* (CPG 4375), *De mutatione nominum* (CPG 4372), and *In principium Actorum* (CPG 4371)', *Augustinianum* 46 (2006) 169–186.
- Mayer, W. 'A Son of Hellenism: Viewing John Chrysostom's Anti-Intellectualism through the Lens of Antiochene Paideia', in Bergjan–Elm (eds.), *Antioch II*, 369–390.
- McFarland, O. 'Philo's Prepositional Metaphysics within Early Christian Debates about the Relation of Divine Nature and Agency', *Studia Philonica* (2015) 87–109.
- McLeod, F.G. *The Image of God in the Antiochene Tradition*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999.
- McLeod, F.G. *Theodore of Mopsuestia. The Early Church Fathers*. London–New York: Routledge, 2009.
- McNamee, K. 'Aristarchus and "Everyman's" Homer', *GRBS* 22.3 (1981) 247–255.
- Méhat, A. 'Divination païenne et prophétie chrétienne', in R.J. Daly (ed.), *Origeniana Quinta*, BETL 105. Leuven: Peeters, 1992, 436–441.
- Amand de Mendieta, E. *Fatalisme et liberté dans l'antiquité grecque. Recherches sur la survivance de l'argumentation morale antifataliste de Carnéade chez les philosophes grecs et les théologiens chrétiens des quatre premiers siècles*. Leuven: Peeters, 1945.
- Menn, S. 'The Stoic Theory of Categories', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 17 (1999) 215–247.
- Menn, E.M. *Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38) in Ancient Jewish Exegesis. Studies in Literary Form and Hermeneutics*, SJSJ 51. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Menn, S. 'The Stoic Theory of Categories', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 17 (1999) 215–247.
- Méridier, L. *L'influence de la seconde sophistique sur l'œuvre de Grégoire de Nysse*. Paris: Hachette, 1906.
- Mette, H.J. *Parateresis. Untersuchungen zur Sprachtheorie des Krates von Pergamon*. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1952.

- Mitchell, M.M. In R.A. Greer–M.M. Mitchell, *The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor. Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church*, WGRW 16. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2007.
- Mitchell, M.M. *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*, HUTh 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Molinié, P. *Jean Chrysostome exégète. Le commentaire homilétique de la Deuxième épître de Paul aux Corinthiens*, OCA 305. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2019.
- Mondrain, B. 'Bernard de Montfaucon et l'étude des manuscrits grecs', *Scriptorium* 66.2 (2012) 281–316.
- Montanari, F.–S. Matthaios–A. Rengakos. *Brill's Companion to Ancient Scholarship*, 2 vols., Brill's Companions to Classical Studies. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Morlet, S. *La Démonstration évangélique d'Eusèbe de Césarée. Étude sur l'apologétique chrétienne à l'époque de Constantin*, EAA 187. Turnhout: Brepols, 2009.
- Morlet, S. 'Eusebius and the *Testimonia*: Tradition and Originality', in A.-C. Jacobsen–J. Ulrich (eds.), *Three Greek Apologists: Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2007, 93–157.
- Morlet, S. 'Eusebius' Polemic Against Porphyry: A Reassessment', in Inowlocki–Zamagni (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius*, 119–150.
- Morlet, S. 'Origen as Exegetical Source', in Johnson–Schott (eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea*, 207–237.
- Morlet, S. 'Pourquoi Dieu a-t-il interdit la connaissance du bien et du mal? La critique porphyrienne de Gn 2,17: le problème de ses sources et de sa postérité', *Semítica et Classica* 4 (2011) 125–146.
- Morlet, S. 'La source principale du *Quod Christus sit Deus* attribué à Jean Chrysostome: la *Démonstration évangélique* d'Eusèbe de Césarée', *RÉAug* 58.2 (2012) 261–285.
- Morlet, S. *Symphonia. La concorde des textes et des doctrines dans la littérature grecque jusqu'à Origène*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2019.
- Morlet, S. 'Un nouveau témoignage sur le *Contra Christianos* de Porphyre', *Semítica et Classica* 1 (2008) 157–166.
- Morlet, S. 'L'utilisation des révisions juives de la Septante dans la première littérature chrétienne. Philologie, exégèse et polémique', in R. Gounelle–J. Joosten (eds.), *La Bible juive dans l'Antiquité*. Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2014, 117–140.
- Nathan, G. *The Family in Late Antiquity. The Rise of Christianity and the Endurance of Tradition*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Narinskaya, E. *Ephrem, a 'Jewish' Sage. A Comparison of the Exegetical Writings of St. Ephrem the Syrian and Jewish Traditions*, STT 7. Turnhout, 2010.
- Nassif, B. "'Spiritual Exegesis" in the School of Antioch', in B. Nassif (ed.), *New Perspectives on Historical Theology. Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996, 343–377.
- Nautin, P. 'Genèse 1, 1–2, de Justin à Origène', in *In Principio. Interprétations des premiers versets de la Genèse*, EAA 38. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1973, 61–94.

- Neuschäfer, B. *Origenes als Philologe*, SBA 18.1–2. Basil: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1987.
- Nickau, K. *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos*, UaLG 16. Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977.
- Niehoff, M. 'Creatio ex Nihilo Theology in Genesis Rabbah in Light of Christian Exegesis', *HTR* 99.1 (2006) 37–64.
- Niehoff, M. 'Homeric Scholarship and Bible Exegesis in Ancient Alexandria: Evidence from Philo's "Quarrelsome" Colleagues', *CQ* 57.1 (2007) 166–182.
- Niehoff, M. 'Philo and Plutarch on Homer', in M.R. Niehoff (ed.), *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*, JSRC 16. Leiden: Brill, 2012, 127–154.
- Nünlist, R. *The Ancient Critic at Work. Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Nünlist, R. 'Aristarchus and Allegorical Interpretation', in S. Matthaios et al. (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar*, 105–118.
- Ondrey, M. *The Minor Prophets as Christian Scripture in the Commentaries of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Cyril of Alexandria*, OECs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Pagani, L. 'Pioneers of Grammar: Hellenistic Scholarship and the Study of Language', in F. Montanari–L. Pagani (eds.), *From Scholars to Scholia: Chapters in the History of Ancient Greek Scholarship*, TCSV 9. Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2011, 17–64.
- Papadogiannakis, Y. 'Didacticism, Exegesis, and Polemics in pseudo-Kaisarios's *erotapokriseis*', in Bussièrès (ed.), *La littérature*, 271–289.
- Papadogiannakis, Y. '“Encyclopedism” in the Byzantine question-and-answer literature —the case of Pseud-Kaisarios', in P. Van Deun–C. Macé, *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium? Proceedings of the International Conference Held in Leuven, 6–8 May 2009*, OLA 212 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 29–44.
- Papadogiannakis, Y. 'Instruction by Question and Answer: The Case of Late Antique and Byzantine *Erotapokriseis*', in S.F. Johnson (ed.), *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity. Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2006), 91–105.
- Paulsen, D.L. 'Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnesses', *HTR* 83.2 (1990) 105–116.
- van de Pavard, F. *St. John Chrysostom. The Homilies on the Statues. An Introduction*, OCA 239. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1991.
- Pedersen, N.A. *Demonstrative Proof in Defence of God. A Study of Titus of Bostra's Contra Manichaeos. The Work's Sources, Aims, and Relation to its Contemporary Theology*, NHMS 56. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Pépin, J. 'À propos de l'histoire de l'exégèse allégorique: l'absurdité, signe de l'allégorie', *StPatr* 1 (1957), 395–413.
- Pépin, J. *Mythe et allégorie. Les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*. Paris: Aubier, 1958.
- Pépin, J. 'Recherches sur le sens et les origines de l'expression *caelum caeli* dans le livre XII des Confessions de s. Augustin', *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 23 (1953) 185–274.

- Peraki-Kyriakou, H. 'Aspects of Ancient Etymologizing', *CQ* 52 (2002) 478–493.
- Perrin, M. *L'homme antique et chrétien: l'anthropologie de Lactance*, 250–325, *ThHist* 59. Paris: Beauchesne, 1981.
- Perrone, L. 'Il discorso protrettico di Origene sulla preghiera. Introduzione al Περὶ Εὐχῆς', in F. Cocchini (ed.), *Il dono e la sua ombra: ricerche sul Περὶ Εὐχῆς di Origene. Atti del I Convegno del Gruppo Italiano di Ricerca su 'Origene e la Tradizione Alessandrina'*, SEA 57 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1997), 7–32.
- Perrone, L. 'Perspectives sur Origène et la littérature patristique des « quaestiones et responsiones », in Alexandre et al. (eds.), *Origeniana Sexta*, 151–164.
- Perrone, L. 'Sulla preistoria delle «quaestiones» nella letteratura patristica. Presupposti e sviluppi del genere letterario fino al IV sec.', *ASE* 8 (1991) 485–505.
- Petit, F. 'La Chaîne grecque sur la Genèse miroir de l'exégèse ancienne,' in Schöllgen–Scholten (eds.), *Stimuli*, 243–253.
- Petit, F. 'Diodore de Tarse dans la tradition caténique sur la Genèse et l'Exode. Une mise au point', *Le Muséon* 112 (1999) 363–379.
- Petit, F. 'La tradition de Théodore de Cyr dans les chaînes sur la Genèse.' *Le Muséon* 92 (1979) 1–21.
- Pfeiffer, R. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Pippin, R.B. 'Blumenberg and the Modernity Problem', *The Review of Metaphysics* 40.3 (1987) 535–557.
- Pirot, L. *L'œuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste*. Rome: Institut biblique, 1913.
- Pizzolato, L.F. 'L'antitipo: un concetto tra esegesi e mistagogia', *ASE* 17 (2000) 161–202.
- des Places, E. *Eusèbe de Césarée commentateur. Platonisme et Écriture sainte* (Théologie historique 63). Paris: Beauchesne, 1982.
- Pohlenz, M. 'Τὸ πρέπον: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des griechischen Geistes', *NAWG—Philologisch-historische Klasse* 1 (1933) 53–93.
- Polidoulis Kapsalis, M.-F. *Image as Authority in the Writings of John Chrysostom*, Ph.D. diss., University of St Michael's College. University of Toronto, 2001.
- Pomeroy, S.A. 'Numbering the Heaven(s): John Chrysostom's Use of Greek Exegetical Traditions for Interpreting Gen 1,6–8 (*Hom. Gen.* IV)', *ETL* 92.2 (2016) 203–228.
- Pomeroy, S.A. 'Reading Plato through the Eyes of Eusebius: John Chrysostom's *Timaeus* Quotations in Rhetorical Context', in Mayer–de Wet (eds.), *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, 464–492.
- Pomeroy, S.A. 'Representing the Jews: John Chrysostom's Use of Exegetical and Theological Traditions for Gen 1:26a (*In Gen. hom.* 8)', in G. Roskam–J. Verheyden (eds.), *Light on Creation: Ancient Commentators in Dialogue and Debate on the Origin of the World*, STAC 104. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017, 105–126.
- Pouchet, J.-R. 'Basile de Césarée, éducateur de la foi et promoteur de la charité, d'après sa correspondance', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 102.1 (2007) 5–46.

- Pouchet, J.-R. *Basile le Grande et son univers d'amis d'après sa correspondance*, SEA 36. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1992.
- Pouchet, J.-R. 'Les rapports de Basile de Césarée avec Diodore de Tarse,' *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 87 (1986) 243–272.
- Quiroga Puertas, A.J. *La retórica de Libanio y de Juan Crisóstomo en la Revuelta de las estatuas*, Cardo 7. Salerno: Helios, 2007.
- Rahfls, A. *Die alttestamentlichen Lektione der griechischen Kirche*, MUS 1.5. Berlin: Weidmann, 1915.
- Ramelli, I. *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis: A Critical Assessment from the New Testament to Eriugena*, SVC 120. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Recheis, A. *Engel, Tod und Seelenreise: das Wirken der Gester beim Heimgang des Menschen in der Lehre der Alexandrinischen und Kappadokischen Väter*, TeT 4 (Roma: Storia e letteratura, 1958).
- Reuling, H. *After Eden. Church Fathers and Rabbis on Genesis 3:16–21*, JCPS 10. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Richard, M. 'Quelques manuscrits peu connus des chaînes exégétiques et des commentaires grecs sur le Psautier,' *Revue d'histoire des textes* 3 (1955) 87–106.
- Riedweg, Ch. 'Julians Exegese der Rede des Demiurgen an die versammelten Götter in Platons Timaios 41 A–D: Anmerkungen zu Contra Galilaeos fr. 10 Mas', in D. Auger–É. Wolff (eds.), *Culture classique et christianisme: Mélanges offerts à Jean Bouffartigue*. Paris, 2008, 83–95.
- Riedweg, Ch. 'Mythos mit geheimem Sinn oder reine Blasphemie?: Julian über die mosaische Erzählung vom Sündenfall („Contra Galilaeos“ fr. 17,10–12 Masaracchia)', in A. Kolde–A. Lukinovich–A.-L. Rey (eds.), *Κορυφαίω ἀνδρί. Mélanges offerts à André Hurst*. Geneva: Droz, 2005, 367–375.
- Rinaldi, G. *La Bibbia dei pagani*, La Bibbia nella storia 19. Bologna: Ed. Dehoniane, 1997.
- Rinaldi, G. 'Tracce di controversie tra pagani e cristiani nella letteratura patristica delle 'quaestiones et responsiones'', ASE 6 (1989) 99–124.
- Rogers, J.M. *Didymus the Blind and the Alexandrian Christian Reception of Philo*, SPM 8. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2017.
- Rogers, J.M. 'The Philonic and the Pauline: Hagar and Sarah in the Exegesis of Didymus the Blind,' *Studia Philonica* 26 (2014) 57–77.
- Rollinson, P. *Classical Theories of Allegory and Christian Culture*, Duquesne Studies 3. Pittsburg, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1981.
- ter Haar Romeny, R.B. 'Early Antiochene Commentaries on Exodus,' in *StPatr* 30 (1997) 114–119.
- ter Haar Romeny, R.B. 'Eusebius of Emesa's Commentary on Genesis and the Origins of the Antiochene School,' in Frishman–Van Rompay (eds.), *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation*, 125–142.

- ter Haar Romeny, R.B. *A Syrian in Greek Dress: The Use of Greek, Hebrew and Syriac Biblical Texts in Eusebius of Emesa's Commentary on Genesis*, TEG 6. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- Rousseau, P. *Basil of Caesarea*, TCH 20. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998.
- Rousseau, P. 'Homily and Exegesis in the Patristic Age: Comparisons of Purpose and Effect', in A.J. Quiroga Puertas (ed.), *The Purpose of Rhetoric in Antiquity. From Performance to Exegesis*, STAC72. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013, 11–29.
- Runia, D.T. *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*, CRI 3. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993.
- Runia, D.T. *Philo and the Church Fathers: A Collection of Papers*, SVC 32. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Runia, D.T. "Where, Tell Me, is the Jew ...?": Basil, Philo and Isidore of Pelusium', VC 46 (1992) 172–189.
- Rutherford, W.G. *A Chapter in the History of Annotation, being Scholia Aristophanica*, 3 vols. London: Macmillan & Co., 1905.
- Rylaarsdam, D. *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy. The Coherence of his Theology and Preaching*, OECs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Sæbø, M. (ed.) *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament. 1: From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300). Part 1: Antiquity*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Salvesen, A. (ed.) *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments. Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Sandwell, I. 'A Milky Text Suitable for Children: The Significance of John Chrysostom's Preaching on Gen. 1:1 for Fourth-Century Audiences', in W.J. Lyons–I. Sandwell (eds.), *Delivering the Word: Preaching and Exegesis in the Western Christian Tradition*. London: Routledge, 2012, 80–98.
- Sandwell, I. 'How to Teach Genesis 1.1–19: John Chrysostom and Basil of Caesarea on the Creation of the World', JECs 19.4 (2011) 539–564.
- Sandwell, I. 'Preaching and Christianisation: Communication, Cognition and Audience Reception', in Mayer–de Wet (eds.), *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, 137–174.
- Sandwell, I. *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews, and Christians in Antioch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Schäublin, Ch. 'Zu Diodors von Tarsos Schrift gegen die Astrologie (Phot. Bibl. Cod. 223)', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 123.1 (1989) 51–67.
- Schäublin, Ch. 'Zum paganen Umfeld der christlichen Predigt', in E. Mühlenberg–J. van Oort (eds.), *Predigt in der alten Kirche*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994, 25–49.
- Schäublin, Ch. *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der Antiochenischen Exegese, Theophaneia* 23. Cologne–Bonn: Hanstein, 1974.
- Schironi, F. *The Best of the Grammarians: Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad*. Ann Arbor, MI, 2018.
- Schmidt, M. 'Portrait of an Unknown Scholiast', in Matthaios et al. (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar*, 119–158.

- Schöllgen, G.–C. Scholten. *Stimuli. Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassman*, JBAC ERG 23. Münster: Aschendorff, 1996.
- Schor, A. 'Theodoret on the "School of Antioch": A Network Approach', *J ECS* 15.4 (2007) 517–562.
- Schor, A. *Theodoret's People: Social Networks and Religious Conflict in Late Roman Syria*, TCH 48. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011.
- Schweizer, E. 'Diodor von Tarsus als Exeget', *ZNW* 40 (1941) 33–75.
- Scopello, M. 'Les «Testimonia» dans le traité de «L'exégèse de l'âme» (Nag Hammadi, 11,6)', *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 191.2 (1977) 159–171.
- Scott, A. *Origen and the Life of the Stars: A History of an Idea*, OECs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Sellew, P. 'Achilles or Christ? Porphyry and Didymus in Debate over Allegorical Interpretation', *HTR* 82.1 (1989) 79–100.
- Seppänen, M. *Defining the Art of Grammar: Ancient Perceptions of γραμματική and grammatica*, Annales Universitatis Turkuensis, b 379. Turku: University of Turku, 2014.
- Shepardson, C. *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy*. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press, 2014.
- Simon, M. *Verus Israël. Étude sur les relations entre chrétiens et juifs dans l'Empire romain (135–425)*, BEFAR 166. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1948.
- Simonetti, M. *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church. An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, trans. J.A. Hughes. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
- Simonetti, M. *Littera e/o allegoria: uno contributo alla storia dell'esegesi patristica*, SEA 23. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1985.
- Sirinelli, J. *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée durant la période prénicéenne*, Université de Dakar. Fac. des lettres et sciences humaines. Publications de la Section de langues et littératures 10. Dakar: Université de Dakar, 1961.
- Sitzler, S. 'Identity: The Indigent and the Wealthy in the Homilies of John Chrysostom', *VC* 63 (2009) 468–479.
- Skarsaune, O. 'The Development of Scriptural Interpretation in the Second and Third Centuries—except Clement and Origen', in M. Sæbø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament*, 373–442.
- Slater, W.J. 'Aristophanes of Byzantium and Problem-Solving in the Museum', *CQ* 32.2 (1982) 336–349.
- Sluiter, I. *Ancient Grammar in Context. Contributions to the Study of Ancient Linguistic Thought*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1990.
- Smalley, B. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952.
- Smelova, N. 'St John Chrysostom's Exegesis on the Prophet Isaiah: The Oriental Translations and their Manuscripts', *StPatr* 67 (2013) 295–309.

- Stavrou, M.–J. van Rossum (dir.). *Écriture et tradition chez les Pères de l'Église*, CBP 17. Brepols: Turnhout, 2017.
- Steiger, P.D. 'The Image of God in the Commentary *On Genesis* of Didymus the Blind', *StPatr* 42 (2006) 243–249.
- Stenger, J. 'Athens and/or Jerusalem? Basil's and Chrysostom's Views on the Didactic Use of Literature and Stories', in P. Van Nuffelen–L. Van Hoof–P. Gemeinhardt (eds.), *Education and Religion in Late Antiquity: Genres and Discourses in Transition*. London: Routledge, 2013, 86–99.
- Stenger, J. *Johannes Chrysostomos und die Christianisierung der Polis. »Damit die Städte Städte werden«*, STAC 115. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- Stenger, J. 'John Chrysostom and the Power of Literary Imagination', in J. Stenger (ed.), *Spätantike Konzeptionen von Literature*, The Other Antiquity 2. Heidelberg: Winter, 2015, 207–226.
- Stenger, J. 'On the Use and Abuse of Philosophy for Life: John Chrysostom's Paradoxical View of Knowledge', in K. Geus–M.J. Geller (eds.), *Esoteric Knowledge in Antiquity*. Berlin: Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, 2014, 85–105.
- Stenger, J. 'Palestine as a Palimpsest: Eusebius' Construction of Memorial Space in the *Onomasticon*', *Exemplaria Classica* (Huelva) 7 (2016) 85–105.
- Stenger, J. 'Text Worlds and Imagination in Chrysostom's Pedagogy', in Mayer–de Wet (eds.), *Revisioning*, 206–246.
- Stenger, J. 'Where to Find Christian Philosophy? Spatiality in John Chrysostom's Counter to Greek *Paideia*', *J ECS* 24.2 (2016) 173–198.
- Sterk, A. *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church. The Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Sterling, G.E. 'Prepositional Metaphysics in Jewish Wisdom Speculation and Early Christian Liturgical Texts', in D.T. Runia–G.E. Sterling (eds.), *Wisdom and Logos: Studies in Jewish Thought*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997, 219–238.
- Taylor, D.G.K. 'Bilingualism and Diglossia in Late Antique Syria and Mesopotamia', in J.N. Adams–N. Janse–S. Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 298–331.
- Thome, F. *Historia contra mythos. Die Schriftauslegung Diodors von Tarsus und Theodors von Mopsuestia im Widerstreit zu Kaiser Julians und Salustius' allegorischen Mythenverständnis*, Hereditas 24. Bonn: Borengässer, 2004.
- Ticciati, S. 'Proverbs 8:22 and the Arian Controversy', in K.J. Dell–W. Kynes (eds.), *Reading Proverbs Intertextually*. London: Bloomsbury, 2019, 179–190.
- de Tillemont, L. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, vol. VII. Bruxelles: E.H. Fricx, 1702.
- Tloka, J. *Griechische Christen—Christliche Griechen. Plausibilisierungsstrategien des antiken Christentums bei Origenes und Johannes Chrysostoms*, STAC 30. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

- Tonias, D. *Abraham in the Works of John Chrysostom*, Emerging Scholars. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014.
- Tov, E. 'The Rabbinic Tradition Concerning the 'Alterations' Inserted into the Greek Translation of the Torah and their Relation to the Original Text of the Septuagint', in *Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999, 1–20.
- Usener, H. *Kleine Schriften, Bd. 2: Arbeiten zur Lateinischen Sprache und Literatur*. Leipzig–Berlin: Teubner, 1913.
- Vaggione, R.P. *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, OECs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Van Dam, R. *Becoming Christian. The Conversion of Roman Cappadocia*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- Van Deun, P. 'ΕΥΧΗ distingué de ΠΡΟΕΥΧΗ: un essai de précision terminologique chez les pères grecs et les écrivains byzantins', in J. Den Boeft (ed.), *The Impact of Scripture in Early Christianity*, SVC 44. Leiden: Brill, 1999, 202–222.
- Van Rompay, L. 'Antiochene Biblical Interpretation: Greek and Syriac', in Frishman–Van Rompay (eds.), *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation*, 103–123.
- Van Rompay, L. 'L' informateur Syrien de Basile de Césarée. A propos de Genèse 1,2', *OCF* 58 (1992) 245–251.
- Van Winden, J.C.M. *Arche: A Collection of Patristic Studies*, SVC 41. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Verde, F. *Elachista. La dottrina dei minimi nell'Epicureismo*, De Wolf–Mansion Centre, Series 1, 48. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.
- Viciano, A. 'Das formale Verfahren der Antiochenischen Schriftauslegung', in Schöllgen–Scholten (eds.), *Stimuli*, 357–369.
- Vinel, E. 'Basile de Césarée face aux divisions de l'Église d'après sa correspondance', *Revue des sciences religieuses* 81.1 (2007) 79–93.
- Voisin, G. *L'Apollinarisme. Étude historique, littéraire et dogmatique sur le début des controverses christologiques au IV^e siècle*. Leuven: Peeters, 1901.
- Vuolanto, V. *Children and Asceticism in Late Antiquity. Continuity, Family Dynamics and the Rise of Christianity*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2015.
- Wallace-Hadrill, D.S. *Greek Patristic Views of Human Nature*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968.
- Wallraff, M. 'Christliche Liturgie als religiöse Innovation in der Spätantike', in W. Kinzig et al. (eds.), *Liturgie und Ritual in der Alten Kirche. Patristische Beiträge zum Studium der gottesdienstlichen Quellen der Alten Kirche*, SPA 11. Leuven: Peeters, 2011, 69–97.
- Weedman, M. *The Trinitarian Theology of Hilary of Poitiers*, SVC 89. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Wenger, A. 'Jean Chrysostome', in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, vol. 8. Paris: Beauchesne, 1974, 331–369.
- Wetzel, R. *Das vierundzwanzigste Kapitel des Evangelisten Matthäus in der Auslegung durch die griechischen Väter Origenes und Chrysostomus*. Diss. Tübingen, 1978.

- Wilken, R.L. *John Chrysostom and the Jews. Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th-Century*, TCH 4. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press, 1984.
- Williams, J. 'Letter Writing, Materiality, and Gifts in Late Antiquity: Some Perspectives on Material Culture', *Journal of Late Antiquity* 7.2 (2014) 351–359.
- Wilson, N. 'On the Transmission of the Greek Lexica', *GRBS* 23.4 (1982) 369–375.
- Wilson, R.M. 'The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. 1:26', *StPatr* 1 (Berlin, 1957) 420–437.
- Winn, R.E. *Eusebius of Emesa. Church and Theology in the Mid-Fourth Century*. Washington, D.C.: CUA Press, 2011.
- Wright, J. 'Between Despondency and the Demon: Diagnosing and Treating Spiritual Disorders in John Chrysostom's *Letter to Stageirios*', *JLA* 8.2 (2015) 351–367.
- Wucherpfennig, A. *Heracleon Philologus. Gnostische Johannesexegese im zweiten Jahrhundert*, WUNT 142. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Wutz, F. *Onomastica Sacra. Untersuchungen zum Liber Interpretationis nominum hebraicorum des Hl. Hieronymus*, 2 vols., TU 41.1–2. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914–1915.
- Young, F. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Young, F. 'Traditions of Exegesis', in J.C. Paget–J. Schaper (eds.), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to 600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, 734–751.
- Yousif, P. 'Exegetical Principles of St Ephrem the Syrian', *StPatr* 18.4 (1983) 296–302.
- Zachhuber, J. 'Stoic Substance, non-existent Matter? Some Passages in Basil of Caesarea Reconsidered', *StPatr* 41 (2006) 425–431.
- Zaganas, D. *La formation d'une exégèse alexandrine post-origénienne*, TEG 17. Leuven: Peeters, 2019.
- Zamagni, C. 'Eusebius' Exegesis between Alexandria and Antioch: Being a Scholar in Caesarea (a Test Case from *Questions to Stephanos* 1)', in Inowlocki–Zamagni (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius*, 151–176.
- Zamagni, C. 'Existe-t-il une terminologie technique dans les *Questions* d'Eusèbe de Césarée', in A. Volgers–C. Zamagni (eds.), *Erotapokriseis. Early Christian Question-and-Answer Literature in Context*, CBET 37. Leuven: Peeters, 2004, 81–98.
- Zamagni, C. 'Is the Question-and-Answer Literary Genre in Early Christian Literature a Homogeneous Group?', in Bussièrès (ed.), *La littérature*, 241–268.
- Zamagni, C. 'Porphyre est-il la cible principale des «questions» chrétiennes des IV^e et V^e siècles?', in Sébastien Morlet (ed.), *Le traité de Porphyre contre les Chrétiens. Un siècle de recherches, Nouvelles questions. Actes du colloque international organisé les 8 et 9 septembre 2009 à l'Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne*, EAA 190. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2011 357–370.
- Zanker, A.T. *Greek and Latin Expressions of Meaning: The Classical Origins of a Modern Metaphor*, Zetemata 151. München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 2016.

Zerfas, R. *Die Schriftlesung im Kathedraloffizium Jerusalems*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1968.

Zincone, S. 'La funzione dell'oscurità', *StPatr* 32 (1997) 393–409.

Modern Lexica, Grammars, and Reference Works

Ernesti, J.Ch.G. *Lexicon technologiae Graecorum rhetoricae*, 2 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1962.

Lampe, G.H.W. *A Greek Patristic Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1961.

Lust, J.–E. Eynikel–K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.

Marcus, R. 'An Armenian-Greek Index to Philo's *Quaestiones* and *De Vita Contemplativa*', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 53.3 (1933) 251–282.

Payne Smith, R., et al. *Thesaurus Syriacus*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879–1901.

Thackeray, H. St. J. *A Grammar of the Old Testament Greek According to the Septuagint*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

Index of Modern Authors

Albl 252n8, 284n125, 287, 289

Amirav 6, 31, 43–44, 100, 127–129, 185, 251,
274, 292, 297

Asensio 39, 63n106

Astruc-Morize–Le Boulluec 40, 124

Ayres 13

Bady 34

Bate 42n15

Bauer 45, 49

Berglund 10, 13, 260

Blumenberg 5–7

Bonsdorff 45, 46

Breck 16, 248, 280

Broc-Schmezer 28, 35

Brottier 107

Bucur 28, 153, 232, 246, 247

Bultmann 42n15

Chase 27, 129, 171

Chin 161, 296

Cook 28, 32, 108

Costache 50, 275

Crépey 34, 46, 49

Cunningham 34

DelCogliano 20

Druet 138

Esdall 252

Glenthøj 207

Gounnelle 177

Grypeou–Spurling 121, 158, 167, 207

Guillet 17, 291

Guinot 23, 87, 236n34, 270

Hadot 21

Harl 53, 56

Harris 287

Hidal 116, 123, 135

Hill 32, 39, 58, 171

Jacobs 271

Jauss 4–7, 295

Kamesar 25, 173

Lai 226

Leroux 41, 60

Liebeschuetz 40, 177

Lim 77

Markowicz 49

Martens 17, 32, 55

Mayer 28, 45

McFarland 251

Mitchell 42–43, 80

Molinié 33, 79, 90

Neuschäfer 27

Nünlist 116

Ondrey 291

Papadogiannakis 24

Perrone 26, 81

Petit 19, 239n45

Polidoulis Kapsalis 140

Quiroga Puertas 36

Reuling 167

Rogers 264

Runia 224, 251

Rylaarsdam 58, 122

Sandwell 35, 39

Schäublin 25, 32, 124

Stenger 36, 70

Ter Haar Romeny 25, 168, 173

Thome 29, 243, 263

Tloka 250n1

Tonias 39

Van Rompay 168

Viciano 14, 26, 33

Wenger 45

Wilken 42, 77

Young 7, 14, 18, 20, 42, 107, 108, 138, 223, 248,
263, 280, 284

Zamagni 25, 87

Index of Greek Words

ἀθυμία 101
αἰνιγμα, αἰνιγματώδης 12, 52n58, 53, 54n66,
236, 268
αἰνίττεσθαι 51, 65, 72, 137, 152, 174, 238,
241n49, 283
ἀκαριαῖον 218
ἀκολουθία 14, 70, 236, 236n31, 242
ἀκρίβεια 33n17, 62, 85, 158, 159, 222, 237,
256, 307
ἀκυρολογία 111
ἀλήθεια, ἀληθής 54n65, 61, 75, 105, 155, 240,
281, 286, 287, 305
ἀλήτη 71
ἀλληγορεῖν, ἀλληγορία 17, 29n97, 242n53, 271,
293
ἀμυδρῶς 65, 198–199
ἀναγκαῖον, ἀνάγκη 51, 59, 62, 65, 256
ἀνακεφαλαιοῦσθαι 135–136, 136n129, 137
ἀνακύπτειν, ἀνακύπτων 84, 305, 307, 310
ἀνάπτυξις 52n58
ἀναπτύσσειν 84, 188, 269
ἀνάρμοστος 12
ἀντί τοῦ 11, 88, 109, 112, 114, 133, 150n184, 172,
176, 176n33, 188, 191, 192, 256, 273n82,
282n118
ἄξιον 51, 85, 103, 135, 265, 309, 310
ἀόρατος 114, 119n46
ἀπαράλλακτον 226
ἀπεναντία 269
ἀποκατάστασις 74, 286
ἀπορεῖν, ἀπορία 82, 84
ἀσάφεια, ἀσαφής 52–55, 58–59
ἀσθένεια 56n77, 66, 74
αὐτόματα, αὐτομάτως 177, 218, 219

βάθος 33n17, 60, 63, 85, 289

γνώμη 71, 74, 103, 114, 121, 158, 187, 225, 310

δαιψίλεια 64, 66

διὰ τί 85, 87, 88n56

διὰ τοῦτο 88n56

διαλύειν 94

διάνοια 60, 92, 159, 234

διαπορεῖν 51, 73, 85n36, 179n46, 184, 264n49,
305, 306, 310

διδάσκειν, διδασκαλία 59, 219, 222, 256, 240,
242, 271n77, 268, 306

διερευνᾶσθαι 61, 159, 289, 308, 310

διερευνῆσαι 33n17, 60, 85

δύναμις 63, 66, 69, 74

δυσκολία, δύσκολος 38, 58, 59, 86, 146

ἐγκρύπτειν 60, 64, 159, 269

ἔθος 11, 63, 71, 102, 112, 120n53, 123, 125,

126n72, 126n75, 127, 127n80, 128,

128n86, 131, 132, 135, 135n121, 137, 140,

141, 186, 241n49, 274, 286, 291

εἰώθειν 52, 132, 134, 139, 140n148

ἐναλλαγή 11

ἐναντιοῦσθαι, ἐναντία, ἐναντίως 66, 69, 77,

84, 89, 138, 182, 268n64, 305, 309, 310

ἐννοῆσαι, ἔννοια 61, 93, 116

ἐξήγησις 10, 22, 33, 70, 110n12, 110n13

ἐπαπορεῖν 82n29, 245

ἐπιζητεῖν 53, 64, 90n68, 206, 308

ἐπιφύειν 84

ἐρμηνεύειν, ἐρμηνεία 58n85, 93, 94, 139, 144,
147, 147n171, 149, 171n20, 236, 238, 270

ἔως 131

ζητεῖν 51n53, 54n65, 77, 78, 80, 81, 85, 86, 88,
92, 179n46, 183, 199n133, 264, 306, 307,
310

ζήτημα 22, 25, 31–33, 51, 79, 80, 83, 84, 98,
103, 127, 141, 152, 180, 182, 184, 266, 268,
269n71, 305–310

ζητήσαι 51, 81, 85, 85n43, 86, 97, 103, 135,
265, 267, 306, 308–310

ζήτησις 86, 193n101

θεοπρεπῶς 61, 66, 122, 122n59, 257

θεωρία 16

θησαυρός 38, 54n65, 56, 56n77, 60, 63–65,
85, 159, 183, 188, 269

ιδίωμα 11, 123, 126, 131

κάλυμμα 58

κατανοεῖν 62

κρύπτειν 33n17, 53, 54n65, 56, 56n77, 65, 85

κύριος 86, 133n110, 134, 211, 236n30

λέξις 52n58, 63, 89, 111, 111n15, 115, 124n65,
149
λογομαχία 77, 86
λύειν, λύσις 32, 51, 80, 82, 92, 92n82, 98, 152,
182, 206

μεταφορά 55, 139
μίμησις 63, 74
μνήμη 63
μυθολογία 91, 270
μύθος 179n44, 271

νοεῖν 92, 93, 121, 122, 257
νόημα 60, 63, 65, 86
νοῦς 9, 84, 92, 171n20, 214, 246n68

ξενίεσθαι, ξένος 71, 72, 89, 111, 115, 256, 265

ὁμώνυμος, ὁμωνύμως 81, 111
ὀνομάζειν 126, 126n75, 133n112
ὀριστικῶς 131
ὄφελος 116

παντοδαπός 107
παρὰ τό 144
παραβολή 53
παράδεισος 270, 271, 271n76, 271n77
παχύτης 66
περί 48n40, 151, 151n188, 180, 198n125, 241,
271, 272n80, 275, 275n92, 287, 290, 303,
306–308
περιεργάζεσθαι 78, 87
πίστος, πίστις 71, 72, 74
πληθυντικῶς 133
πλούτος 63, 69, 75
πνευματικός 61, 63, 64, 66, 118, 210, 211,
281n13
ποιήσωμεν 64, 223
πολλάκις 63, 81, 125, 134
πολλαχού 125, 125n72, 289
πολυθρύλητον 79, 206, 266, 306, 308
πολύσημος 107
πράττης 286

πρόβλημα 53
προσηγορία 63, 128, 133n112, 221

ρήμα 63, 69, 159, 198

σάρξ 128, 128n86, 211, 212, 212n26, 214,
236n30, 271n74, 274, 275n88
σαφήνεια 55, 56, 58, 59, 159
σαφηνίζειν 55n68
σαφής 38, 52n58, 55, 59, 62, 65, 93n94,
171n20, 271n77
σημαίνειν 89, 92, 92n84, 93, 147n171, 149,
241n50, 282n120, 308
σκοπός 20, 62, 93, 174
συγκατάβασις 89, 122
συγκλείειν 132
συμβολικῶς 282
σύμφωνος 71
σύνδεσμος 89
συνέμπτωσις 111
συνήθεια 11, 112, 123, 123n64, 124, 124n65,
125n72, 126, 130, 134, 136n129

τί δήποτε 87, 88n56
τί ἐστι 94, 109, 115, 188
τίκτειν 84
τίνος ἔνεκεν 88n56
τὸ μέσον 60
τροπικῶς 179n48, 272n80, 277
τύπος 16, 17, 65, 153, 199, 236, 237, 238n45,
281, 281n13, 281n114, 282n120

ὑπόθεσις 9, 34, 62, 63, 74, 100

χρήσθαι 120n53, 126, 149

ψῆγμα 85
ψυχή 92n84, 174, 191, 194n104, 213, 214, 259,
273, 273n82, 274n84, 275n88, 282, 286,
290n143

ῥφέλεια 38, 101, 125, 159

Index of Subjects

- Abel 198n125
 mindset 116
 sacrifice 121
- Abraham (Abram) 62
 calling 88, 182
 circumcision 93
 honour, military alliances 120
 loin / thigh 173
 migration 75, 116, 118
 name 130, 146, 151
 promises 244
 servant (Eliezar) 90
- Acacius
 on Cain's sins 207n17
- Adam
 birth 51
 comforted by Seth 199
 compared to Abel and Seth 302
 compared to Noah 95, 103
 creation of 51, 264n50, 265
 curse of 91, 262, 302
 curse, removal of 199
 descent of human race 63
 faculty of discernment 141–143
 fatherhood of Seth 156, 160
 grief of 208
 judgement of 93
 name, interpretation of 152
 name, spelling of 94
 naming of the beasts 276
 opening of eyes 85, 127, 141
 placed in the garden 126
 prohibition to eat 189
 rib 174
 robe of glory 195–196
 subjugation of Eve 105
 temptation of 82
 transgression 298
- Adrian 14, 32, 55
 anthropology 129
 diplasiasmos 130
 metaphor 139
 on temporal particles 131
 synecdoche 140
- akolouthia* 42
- Anomoean(s) 41, 61, 66, 224
- anthropology 43, 127
- anthropomorphism 44, 121, 275, 276
- Aqedah 28, 235
- Athanasius
 making of man from dust 277
- atomism (theory of matter) 279
- Babel 47, 262
- baptism 107
- Bardesanes 90
- Basil of Caesarea 20, 26, 64, 79, 119, 203
 Letter 260 295
 Noah's drunkenness 266
 on biblical language 124
 serpent 180
 Stoic theories of names 278
- Cain
 progeny and incest 264
 rivalry with Abel 64
 sacrifice 121
 seven sins, judgement 19, 62, 94
- Canaan *See* Noah: sons 92
- catena(e)* 3, 19, 84, 144n163, 169n16, 184, 188, 199, 239n45, 266
 questions-and-answers 85, 88
- Celsus 28, 54
 criticism of creation sequence 136
 Lot's daughters 264
 moral critique of bible 104
 serpent 179n44
- Cham *See* Noah: sons 138
- Christological controversy 155
- Church
 bride of Christ 61n95
 dogmas 136
 typology of blood and water 51, 65, 174
 typology Phares Zara 65, 153, 237
- clarity *See* obscurity
- coats of skin 89, 92n84, 196
- Collectio Coisliniana* 19, 29, 87, 169n16, 207n17, 290
- contradiction 9, 61, 81, 83, 86, 88, 92, 96, 102, 104, 140, 158, 245, 266

- creation 28, 40
 - ex nihilo* 278
 - Gen 1–2 title, sequence 135
 - ingenerate matter 118–120
 - of light 290
- Deinah 117
- depression 101
- dialogue 35, 295
 - audience 101, 104
 - lexical traditions 119
 - traditions 93
 - traditions of glossing 109
- Didymus 43, 64
 - Abram's altar 191
 - anthropology 128
 - flood waters 92
 - incest and polygamy (Cain) 158
 - on God's 'memory' 122
 - on labor and curse 261
 - onomastic and etymological interpretation 145
- Diodore 27, 55, 71
 - Aqedah 282
 - blessing of Judah 137
 - Jacob's bow 140
 - on incest 264
 - on Septuagint habit 127
 - on temporal particles 131
 - Phares and Zara 236
 - preference for historical exegesis 242
 - tautology 130
- Dionysius Thrax 110
- Easter 73
- Eden 51, 79, 86, 92, 152
- election *See* supersession
 - Abraham's God 132
 - Church from gentiles 16–18, 65, 238, 283
 - Eusebian apologetics 231
 - prophecy 58
 - supersession 30
 - supersession (books of scripture) 60
- emotions 117
- encomium* 43
- Enoch 65, 68, 72, 87, 156, 160, 191, 198n125, 199–200, 237
- Enosh 65, 156, 157, 160, 298, 302
- Epiphanius 271
- erotapokriseis* 25
- Eunomius 60, 78, 278
 - Eunomian controversy 134, 136
- Eusebius of Caesarea 27, 56, 79
 - blessing of Judah 137
 - canon tables 13
 - Demonstration on the Gospel* 295
 - Question 7 to Stephen* 295
- Eusebius of Emesa 15, 19, 25, 40, 71
 - alternative versions 144
 - answer formulations 91
 - Aqedah 282
 - blessing of Judah 137
 - Cain 157
 - Cham's curse 104
 - Jacob's bow 140
 - Noah's drunkenness 266
 - on 'spirit of God' 177
 - on Egyptian exile 73
 - on God's 'memory' 122
 - on the flood, arc-in-sky 91
 - paradise narrative 142
 - questions formulations 89, 94
 - recension comparison 57
 - serpent 179
- Eve
 - creation 264n50
 - curse of death 92
 - moral discernment 141
 - opening of eyes 85, 127
 - prohibition to eat 190
 - subjugation to Adam 96, 105
 - temptation 82, 179
- exegetical schools 32, 43
 - scholastic contexts 26, 36
- exegetical traditions 21
 - Alexandrian glosses 259
 - Alexandrians on the flood 128
 - apologetics and questions-and-answers 28
 - departure from Antiochenes 140, 143
 - forms of questioning 80
 - forms of dialogue 93
 - Genesis exegesis 40
 - glossing 118
 - Noah's drunkenness 102
 - restrictive pronouns in Alexandrians 133
 - scholastic contexts 28, 130, 140, 152, 165, 177, 181, 243, 255, 260, 263, 293

- temporal particles 132
- text-referent 49, 90
- family (lineage) 160
- fasting 49
 - of Christ 88
- Forty martyrs of Sebaste 80
- free will 43, 157, 158
 - theodicy 190
- George of Laodicea
 - Against the Manichaeans* 181
 - Homoian traditions 226
- glossing 10, 11, 55, 100
- Gregory of Nazianzus 77
- Gregory of Nyssa 71
 - exegesis of Exodus 73
- heaven(s) 51, 133, 150
 - angels, celestial powers 66
 - Antiochenes on firmament 233
- Hexapla 12, 15
 - Eusebius of Caesarea 233
 - obscurity 55–57
 - onomastic interpretations 144–146
- historia* 16–17, 280, 292, 296
- Holy Spirit 20, 26
 - 'Spirit' in Genesis texts 29n96
 - creation of man from dust 277
 - Divine spirit over humans 43
 - in Marcellus and Eusebius 230n6
 - inhering in Son and Father 134
 - Pentecost 59
 - resting on man 128
 - scriptural inspiration 39, 63
 - scriptural interpretation 86
 - scripture and dogma 136
- Holy Week *See* Lent 47n39
- Homeric commentary 52–53, 79, 93, 109, 123, 125, 129
 - contradiction 268
 - glossing comprehensible terms 116
- homily
 - Byzantine homiletics 34
 - diatribe 100
 - genre definition 27, 31, 33, 83
 - homiletic exegesis 42
- humility 290
- incest 64, 263
 - Adam and Eve's descendants 265, 265n50
 - Cain's progeny 158
 - prohibition anticipated 137
- Irenaeus 14
- Jacob
 - altar 67
 - bowing of parents 140
 - petition for bread 256, 259
 - vision of God 246
 - wrestling 154
- Jerome 25, 26
 - Antiochene school 165
- Jewish exegetical traditions 167, 196, 224
- John Chrysostom
 - Homilies on 2 Corinthians* 90
 - Letter to Stageirios* 101
 - On the Changing of Names* 146
 - On the prologue of Acts* 146m69
 - works, dating
 - Homilies on the Changing of Names* 47
 - Homilies on the Statues* 47
 - Homily 33 on Genesis* 45
 - On the Prologue of Acts* 45
 - Sermons on Genesis* 45, 47
 - Six Homilies on Isaiah* ('I saw the Lord') 47
 - The Obscurity of the Prophets* 47
- Joseph
 - eyesight 120
 - grief 138
- Julian (Emperor) 27–30
 - ad* Gen 49 243
 - allegory 263
 - criticism of Christian bible 58
 - critique of paradise narrative 143
 - on Jesus' fast 212n26
 - serpent 179
- Lactantius 5
- Lamech 265
- Lent 46, 48, 51
- lexical aids
 - in ancient Christian commentary 112
- literary features 12, 14
- Lot 64, 88

- Marcion 29–30
 martyrdom 121
 Mary 89, 131
 mass-communication 36, 133, 243
 Mathousala 130
 Melchizedek 59, 65
mimesis 41, 42
 Moses 39
- Naid 156–158
 natural law 96, 142, 158, 160, 161, 297, 302
 Nebrod 96, 105
 necromantic exegesis 42, 80
 Noah 31
 arc-in-sky 91
 birds 255
 diet 90
 flood 43, 86, 128
 name 149, 261
 post-flood 122
 sons 65, 79, 84, 94–105, 265–267
 non-literal interpretation 14, 72
 allegorical polemics 270
 Antiochenes and Alexandrians 43
 blessing of Judah 137
 Celsus 29
 Chrysostom and Didymus on Noah 261
 Chrysostom and Origen on bread 260
 Chrysostom on anthropomorphism 122
 Chrysostom's sources 248
 Diodore's critique of allegory 248
 etymology and allegory 145
 harmony of OT/NT 121
 Hexaplaric readings 174
 human limitations 62
 Irenaeus and Valentinians 14
 Julian on culture, myth 179n44, 263
 liturgical-spiritualization 213
 moral-allegorical exegesis 216
 name-interpretation, onomastic 156, 198, 236, 261
 of light 290
 philology 14
 prophecy 64
 prophetic reference 141
 scripture interprets scripture 139
 Theodore's formulations 89
 typology 47, 65, 236, 241
 Adam's rib 174
 Noah's sons 105
 Passover 73
 Zorobabel 151
 numbers (biblical) 31, 62, 209
- obscurity 15, 17, 146
 Ondrey 17
 Origen 18, 27, 40, 69
 allegory of light 291
 Celsus on generational punishment 104
 defense of literal meanings 124
 hermeneutics
 Homily on the Witch of Endor 81
 obscurity 54
 questions-and-answers 81
 Joseph's eyesight 120
 Noah's drunkenness, sons 102, 104, 265–267
 on Septuagint habit 126
 on the stars 177
 onomastic and etymological interpretation 145
 pre-existence 270
 Scholia on Genesis 102, 104, 265–267, 276, 291, 295
 Origenist controversy 50, 275
- Passover 73
 Paul 43, 69
 Philo
 onomastic and etymological interpretation 145
 restrictive pronouns 132
 philosophical schools 21
 Porphyry 28, 32, 52, 79
 Procopius of Gaza 22
 prologue 14, 23
 Pseudo-Kaisarios 24
- questions-and-answers 32, 40, 51, 55, 170
 Antiochenes on the stars 177
 apologetics 143, 180
 onomastic traditions 152
 Optimus and Basil on Cain 206
 Origen and Chrysostom 292
 Origen's *Homily on the Witch of Endor* 81

- relation to other genres 104
 - serpent 179
- Rebecca 89
- resurrection 45, 65, 192, 195, 195n108, 196n111, 198n125, 201, 222, 240, 241, 270, 271, 271n78, 298, 302
- Rezeptionsgeschichte* 8, 292
- rhetorical schools 9, 42, 43, 55
 - Second Sophistic 31, 36
- robe of glory *See* Adam: robe
- Sarah 116
- scriptural inspiration *See* Holy Spirit: inspiration
- Seth 156, 157, 160, 198–200, 264n50, 298, 302
- Severian of Gabala 79
- skopos* 18, 42, 43, 72, 108, 121, 122, 127, 174, 290
- Sodom and Gomorrah 93, 197
- Statues (Antiochene riots) 36, 46n31, 49
- Stephen (Protomartyr) 71
- supersession *See* election
- Syriac bible 145, 170
- testimonia* 159
- Text-World(s) 34, 36, 73
 - cognitive dissonance 137
 - correlation 160
- defamiliarization 101, 160, 298
- reassessment 138
- Thamar 65
- Theodore 18
 - Against the Allegorists* 270
 - diplosiasmos* 130
 - on humility 290
 - on sabbath and resurrection 222
 - on the Septuagint 57, 124, 126
 - on temporal particles 131
 - Zorobabel 151
- Theodoret 22, 26, 55, 77, 89
 - paraphrase formulations 92
- theophanic exegesis 28, 232
- theōria* 39, 42, 296
- Titus of Bostra 82, 142
 - serpent 180
- translation 51, 58, 65, 152, 296
 - Hebrew *Vorlage* 129
 - providential Septuagint 133
- tree, of knowledge of good and evil 29, 79, 83, 93, 141–143, 261
- Valentinians 14
- wealth 69, 75
- Wirkungsgeschichte* 8n16

Index of Biblical Citations

Genesis			
1-3	51	3,24	80
1,1	39, 59, 66, 217	3,24b	40, 114
1,1-2	48n41	4	64
1,2	25, 93, 114, 118, 123, 219, 277	4,1	252n7
1,3	293, 301	4,4	114, 121, 172
1,3-5	221, 287, 290	4,9	207n17
1,5	217	4,12-14	148, 149
1,6	114, 311	4,15	94, 206
1,6-8	233	4,17	264
1,11-12	311	4,17-26	156-161
1,16	221	4,25	198
1,17	126, 175-177	4,26	191
1,26	35, 40, 43, 49, 50, 60, 64	5,1-2	63
1,26-28	89	5,3-5	65
1,28	87	5,6	264n50
1,31	193n101, 254, 257	5,24	65, 87
2,3	86, 188, 268	5,25	265
2,4	135-137, 173-174, 299	5,29	148, 254
2,6	269	5,32	31
2,7	20, 40, 93, 193, 264n50, 276, 294	6,3	128-129, 274
2,8	91, 270	6,6	19, 172
2,9	92, 126	6,10	31
2,9-10	269	6,11	43
2,10	269	7,2	31
2,15	86, 176	8,1	66, 114, 122
2,16	93, 189	8,2	92
2,16-17	210	8,7	131, 254, 255
2,17	29, 82, 134	8,13-14	117
2,17b	261	8,21	187
2,20-22	94	9,1	104, 266
2,21	189	9,4	90, 191
2,23	51, 65, 172, 174, 276	9,5	92n84
2,24	140, 186	9,12-13	91
3,1	178, 196	9,18	92
3,1-7	83	9,18-21	265-267
3,2-7	49	9,21-29	84, 94-105
3,5	141	9,27	283
3,6-16	84n30	10,6	100
3,7	127, 142, 197	10,6-9	105
3,16	96, 105, 275	10,24	40n9
3,17	261, 262	10,25	148, 152
3,17-4,9	92	11	47, 67
3,17-19	92	11,1	254, 262
3,21	89, 92n84, 196	11,2	148
3,22-24	271n74	11,31	67, 182, 183
		11,31-32	89

Genesis (cont.)

12,1	85, 114, 116, 118, 244, 285n127
12,1-2	132nn10
12,1-3	67
12,4	68
12,5	67
12,7	67, 114, 115, 183, 244, 292
12,8	190, 254, 256
12,9	115
12,17	114
13,14	258
13,14-15	254
14	59
14,8	148
14,11	114, 116
14,13-16	88
14,14	188
14,18	148, 149
14,21	114, 120
14,23	120n53
15,6	93
15,7-21	75
15,9	255, 259
15,12-16	183
17,1-2	132nn10
17,2	132
17,4-6	148, 149
18,1	188
18,11	116
18,12	114
18,20-21	93, 197
19,1	247n73
19,30-32	64
21,12	172
21,19	127
22	28, 40, 235
22,1-14	244n55
22,13	281
24,2	172
25,19-25	89
25,26	148
26,13	114
27,29	126
27,40	255, 256
27,41	114
28,15	147
28,20	259
28,21	89

28,2022	255
29,30	147
29,33-35	147
32	40
32,3	247
32,3-31	142n154
32,21-24	247
32,28	148
32,38	154
34,5	114, 117
35,7	67
37,10	140, 185
38	65
38,23-28	235-239
38,30	148, 153
40,8	252n7
41,44	148
45,27	114, 115
46,26-27	128
47,11-12	128
47,29-31	140
47,31	185
48,10	114, 120
49	65, 137
49,4	137
49,8-12	239-243
49,9	137
49,10	30
49,11	301, 311
50,10-11	138

Exodus

3	246
3,2	232
3,6	132, 133nn10
6	73
6,14-27	184
12	73
13,18	73, 183
18-21	103
20,12	96, 98
21,17	96
23,1	198
24,18	214
24,28	214
25,31	120n52
32,4	213n30
32,6	210, 213

32,32	95
33,20	61, 245
34,29-35	58
Leviticus	
1,2	311
11,15	256
17,11	273-274
18,6-16	265n50
25,10	209
Numbers	
12,3	286, 288
22,9-35	265
Deuteronomy	
10,20	132n110
15,12	209
24,16	96, 104, 286, 288, 291
32,15	213n30
Joshua	
4,13	115n32
1 Samuel	
2,5	209
3 Regnorum	
1,47	185n73
Job	
3,23	254, 260-262, 293
10,8	277n98
Psalms	
4,5	117n41
5,4	311
7,14	311
9,2	311
16,2	127
23,1	233
31,5	287, 291
33,8	112
36,8	95
38,11-12	97
38,11-14	95, 100
38,12	95, 100
38,13-14	97
40,10	153n197
42,5-6	95

43,24	61
45,11-12	285n127
47,5	311
47,9	311
58,4	286
70,18	131
77,2	53
79,13	237
83,12	134
101,5	198
104,32	71
109,4	95, 97
115,16	233n18
118,73	20, 277, 294
131,1	286
139,4	262, 286
140,3	254
148,1-2	81
148,4	233n18
148,12	311
Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)	
3,10	95, 98
4,8	118n43
39,3	53
Isaiah	
1,18	285n127
2,8	311
5,2	237
6,1	85, 245
6,2	149
8,7-8	139
22,4	95, 97
43,26	159, 287, 289, 291
48,13	218n46
58,12	238
Jeremiah	
5,8	286, 289
7,18	286
8,23	95, 97
14,9	61
15,19	286
31,39	115n28
38,29-30	288
38,30	104, 291
38,80	286

Ezekiel

1,1	246n65
1,28	136
16,3	96, 99
18,20	96, 101, 104, 286, 288
18,23	95, 286, 288
33,11	285n127

Daniel (Th)

8,23	53
9,23	210, 214
13,56	99

Osee

12,11	142, 154, 245
-------	---------------

Amos

4,13	20
6,3	211, 213
7,3	95, 97
9,2	139

Micah

5,1-2	151
-------	-----

Habakkuk

1,3	95, 97
-----	--------

Zechariah

3,6	154
-----	-----

Proverbs

1,6	53
8,22	230
18,7	288, 291
18,17	159, 287

Wisdom

2,24	213n30
11,17	119n47

Matthew

1,2-3	235-239
4,2	88
5,5	286, 289
5,6	114, 118, 118n43
5,8	67
5,18	64
5,38	151

6,9	259
6,11	255, 260
7,1	198
10,34	81
11,29	286
12,28	134
13,43	92
16,18	59
16,26	260
20,16	121
21,2-11	242
28,1	222

Mark

3,3	117
-----	-----

Luke

1,31-35	89
2,14	81
5,16	120n53
11,3	260
13,32	286
16,26	72
23,43	80

John

1,3	20
1,9	287, 290, 293, 301
1,29	281, 282n115
4,10	269
5,17	86, 268, 299
5,39	41, 68, 69, 85
8,56	40n9
10,3	252n8
11,11	96
11,51	265
15,1	242, 301
19,34	174
20,22	20, 277n97

Acts

3,20	198n125
5,23-25	134
7,2	71
7,2-4	68, 89, 182
9,40	147
15,2	193n101

Romans

4,3	93
4,11	93
6,4	107
6,6	107
8,9	128, 274
8,28	138
8,32	281
9–11	250
9,3	95
11,12	311
12,5	252n8
13,9	136
13,13	287, 290, 293, 301
14,10	198

1 Corinthians

6,10	211, 212
8,6	86
11,3	140
11,7	275
11,8–9	174
12,3	259
15,45	277n97

2 Corinthians

3,12–14	58
4,16	211
6,15	149

Galatians

3,27	107
4,24	251n3

Ephesians

2,14	237, 238
4,31	126

Philippians

2,7	155
-----	-----

Colossians

1,16	175n29
2,11	107

1 Thessalonians

4,16	234
------	-----

1 Timothy

2,4	96, 286
2,8	191, 259, 292
6,8–10	69

Titus

3,5	107
-----	-----

Hebrews

5,11	59
10,32	107
11,4	121
11,8	69
11,21	141

Index of Ancient Literature

1 Clement (Holmes)

3.1 (48) 213n30

Acacius

apud Cat. Oct. (ST 201)

ad Ex 20,3–4 (119,1–8) 289n140

ad Ex 20,5–6 (119–120) 104n104

ad Gen 4,15 (114,3–4) 207n17

apud Coisl. (CCSG 15)

108^{bis} (112) 306

apud Procop. (GCS NF 22)

ad 18,8 (271,2) 189n88

Adrian

apud Cat. Ps. (Martens)

Frag. 36 (313) 129n90

Intr. (Martens)

37 (178) 134n113

38 (180) 137n132

57.1–4 (211) 129n90

60 (214) 131n105

70 (228,1–3) 130n97

73.1 (234,10–13) 139n144

73.1–22 (233–269) 135n122

73.4 (240,1–2) 140n148

73.6 (240,17–21) 142n155

73.9 (244,1) 136n126

76 (280,2) 55n69

Aelius Theon

Progymn. (Patillon)

15 (107) 110n14

Ambrose

Ap. David (CSEL 32/2)

9.47–10.55 (330–336) 289n140

Cain (CSEL 32/1)

2.7.24 (399) 289n140

De Noe (CCSL 32/1)

1.2 (413,17) 261n36

29.107–108 (485–487) 262n39

De Par. (CSEL 32/1)

1.1.3 (267) 269n71

Exp. Ev. Luc. (CCSL 14)

3.20–21 (84–91) 239n45

7.173–174 (274) 268n66

Exp. Ps. (CSEL 64)

37.11–13 (144–145) 289n140

Ex. Ps. CXVIII (CSEL 62)

2.14 (27–28) 289n140

10.11 (210) 291n146

Paen. (CSEL 73)

2.7.53 (185) 289n140

Ambrosiaster

QVNT (CSEL 50)

3.1.1 (21) 305

10 (34) 184n65

14.3 (40) 104n104, 289n140,

309

30 (57–58) 289n140

31 (58–60) 306

Amphilochius

C. Haer. (CCSG 3)

19,743 (204) 192n101

20,755 (205) 193n101

121,783 (205) 257n25

Anonymous *apud Cat. Gen.* (TEG)

184 (1.130) 268n66

732 (2.145–146) 308

860 (2.214) 153n196

Anonymous *apud Cat. Ex.* (TEG 10)

375 (266) 184n69

Anonymous *hom. apud BL Add. 17,189*

(*OrSyr* 5)

8.26–27 (266–267) 142n157

Anonymous, *Dial.* (CCSG 30)

1,178–202 (8) 180n53

Antiochene florilegium

apud Procop. (GCS NF 22)

ad 3,21 (151,46) 195n108

Apion

Frag. Gloss. Hom. (SGLG 11/3)

74 (252) 115n28

Asterius

Hom. (Datema)

7.5.1 (74.27–31) 257n25

14.4.3 (208,9–11) 215

Athanasius (AW 2/1)

De Dec.

9.1–2 (8,15–18) 277n99

Syn.

27.3.12 (255,16–17) 212n26

27.14 (255) 223n67

Augustine

Civ. (CSEL 40)

13.24.5 (655–660) 274n84

De Gen. ad litt. (CSEL 28/3/2)

7.2 (201,25–26) 274n84

Barhadbeshabba

Causa (PO 18)

375.3 21n65

Basil of Caesarea

De jej. (PG 31)

1.3–10 (164–168) 209–216

1.5 (53.169c) 213n29

1.5 (169) 309

1.10 (53.181b) 213n27

Ep. (Courtonne)

9.3 (I, 39,11–14) 226n79

66.2 (I, 158,9–10) 203n1

66.2 (I, 159,4–6) 203n1

113–114 (II, 16–19) 204n5

135.1–2 (II, 49–51) 204n7

140.2 (II, 61–62) 204n4

223.4 (III, 15) 104n104, 309

223.5 (III, 15) 289n140

244.3 (III, 77,22) 203n3

260.2–3 (III, 105–108) 205–209

260.3 (III, 107–108) 94n97

Eun. (SC 299)

1.10.1–7 (204) 134n116

1.18 (236,8–9) 225n79

1.21 (248) 217n44

Hex. (GCS NF 2)

1.1 (1,9) 218n45

1.2 (5) 219n48

1.6 (11,15) 218n46

1.6 (11,17–18) 219n47

1.6 (12,2–3) 171n20

1.8 (15) 280n108

2.2 (23,15) 119n46

2.6 (31,17) 26n85, 178n43

2.7 (34,2–22) 221n58

2.8 (33–34) 290n145

2.8 (34,20–24) 125n72

2.8 (35,18–19) 217n44

3.7 (50) 219n48

3.10 (55) 257n25

4.3 (60,6–9) 219n51

5.5 (77) 219n48

5.6 (77) 219n48

6.5 (96–97) 219n48

7.1 (113) 219n48

9.1 (146–147) 205n10

9.6 (159–160) 224n72

Hom. Ps. (PG 29)

33.2 (356) 290n143

Quod deus (PG 31)

2 (332b) 79n15

8 (345d) 180n49

9 (348c–d) 180n50, 306

10 (353a) 180n51

Reg. brev. (PG 31)

252 (1252) 260n33

Bereshit Rabbah (Theodor–Albeck)

8.3.1 (I, 307–308) 224n71

20.12.2 (II, 550) 197n121

85.14 (II, 1049) 235n28

ChronQ

apud Procop. (GCS NF 22)

15.5 (252–253) 310

Cyril of Alexandria

Glaph. Gen. (PG 69)

6.3 (332) 120n51

Cyril of Jerusalem

Catech. hom. (PG 33)

11.18 (713) 226n80

14.27 (861a) 246n65

Didymus*apud Cat. Acta* (CGPNT 3)*ad* 9,40 (167) 147n171*Comm. Iob* (PTA 1)

85,7–31 (242–244) 254n11

ad 3,23 (242–244) 261n36*Comm. Ps.* (PTA 6)

270,34 (200) 289n140

Comm. Ps. (PTA 12)

294,30–31 (26) 153n197

Frag. Ps. (PTS 16)

573a (11,12–13) 262n41

1229 (334) 254n13

In Gen. (SC)

3,11–13 (233,38) 119n47

6–8 (233,44–48) 287n134

8a,9 (233,48) 293n147

22 (233,66) 254n10

23,5–8 (233,68) 218n46

56–57 (142–144) 276n96

68 (233,170) 254n10

70,8–15 (233,174) 291n146

106 (233,250–254) 196n112, 197n116

130 (233,302,4–5) 178n43

135,27 (233,314) 158n212

137 (233,316) 264n48

148–149 (244,16–18) 199n132

153 (244,26) 129n89, 274n87

167,19–20 (244,60) 278n101

181–185 (244,92–98) 308

188,30 (244,108) 254n11

190 (244,112,10) 212n26

194,15–23 (244,122–124) 122n58–59, 92n81

216,21 (244,156) 85n37

223 (244,172,19) 254n14, 191n96

224,3 (244,174) 259n29

231 (244,191) 184n65

Diodore*apud Coisl.* (CCSG 15)5 (5) 66n124, 220n55,
220n57

28,6–15 (28–29) 290n145

32,10–14 (32) 178n43

52,7 (51) 176n33

52^{bis} 176n30, 176n35

70 (67–68) 82n29, 276n96

83 (86,2–4) 274n84

100,11–12 (103)

103,2–3 (106)

106 (108–109)

109 (113)

118 (120)

128,4–11 (132)

135 (136)

145,2 (145)

151,1–9 (151)

154 (153,9)

164,2 (161)

168 (164–165)

174,12 (169)

177,7–11 (173)

188 (185–186)

203 (198)

204 (200–201)

208 (204)

267,27–30 (249)

291 (264–265)

299 (273–274)

299–300 (273–276)

300 (276)

302,9–21 (279)

306,8–12 (284)

apud Flor. Cod. Add. 12156 (Behr)

14 (178)

apud Photius (Henry)

223 (IV 8–48)

Comm. in Ps. (CCSG 6)*ad* 16,2b (85)*ad* 18,2b (110)*ad* 29,9 (168)*ad* 31,3b (183,36–37)*ad* 35,7 (211)*ad* 36,1 (215)*ad* 47,5 (286)*ad* 47,9d (288)**Dionysius Thrax***Ars gramm.* (GG 1/1)

1 (5–6)

12 (24,1–6)

Thucyd. (Usener)

55 (417,22–25)

172

179n48

306

306

197n116, 271n74

208, 209

264n50

172

187n80

192n100

84n34

153n196

85n39

182n59

259n28

90n72

144n163, 282n120

172, 173n25

236n29

185n73

137n132

241

242n53

242n51

145n163

155n209

175n29

127n80

134n114

133n111

55n72

133n111

129n90

126n75

126n72

10n21, 110n13,

144n161

146n167

52n58

Diyarbakir Genesis Commentary (CSCO 483)

ad Gen 2,4 (23,12–14) 136n126
ad Gen 2,25 (44,10–21) 196n114, 197n118

Elias

In Isag. (CAG 18/1)
 122,25–123,11 52n58

Ephraem Graecus

Serm. In Enoch apud Cat. Gen. (TEG 2)
 593–597 (62–65) 199n130

Ephrem

Comm. Gen. (CSCO 152)
 2.14.2 (33,9–11) 195n110
 2.33 (45,8) 197n120
 5.2.1 (55,8–10) 199n128
 16.1.2 (76,26–28) 198n123
 21.2.1 (85,6) 173n24
Parad. (CSCO 175)
 8.8 (34,24–26) 194n105

Epiphanius

Anc. (GCS 25)
 54.2 (63,10–13) 271n76
Pan. (GCS 37)
 73.21 (293–294) 226n81

Eunomius

Apol. (Vaggione)
 26.11 (68–70) 226n82

Eusebius of Caesarea

Ecl. Proph. (Gaisford)
 1.3 (6) 183n60
Comm. in Ps. (PG 23)
ad 16,13–14 (165) 118n43
ad 18,2 (188–189) 133n113, 233n18
ad 23,1 (220d) 234n19
ad 23,4–8 (224a) 234n24
ad 73,16 (864) 221n59
ad 80 (969) 247n74
ad 80,2–3 (972a–b) 194n104
Comm. Isa. (Ziegler)
 2.25 (282) 289n140
Dem. Ev. (GCS 23)
 5.11.7 (235,7) 247n74
 8.1.63 (364,5–9) 240

8.1.66 (364,13) 240, 241n50
 8.1.72 (365,21) 240
 8.1.78 (366,21c) 240

Ecl. Proph. (Gaisford)

1.3 (6,18–26) 244n60
 1.3 (10,11–20) 244n56
 1.3 (11,11–25) 245n63
 1.3 (12,2–5) 246n67
 4.9 (188,16) 240

Hist. eccl. (GCS 9/1)

4.26.2 (382,7) 275n92
 5.27.1 (498) 79n15

Hypomn. (TU 183)

3.26–32 (246) 233n16
 13.5–15 (260) 233n16

Onom. (GCS NF 24)

β' 191 (49) 149n174
 ζ' 193 (51*,15) 145n164
 ν' 724 (175) 158n212
 λ' 645 (156,2–3) 145n163

Praep. Ev. (GCS 43/1, 43/2)

10.14.2 (609,15–17) 153n196
 11.6.31 (18,12–13) 154n202, 246n68
 14.26.2 (331,15) 279n104

Q. Ev. (SC 523)

7.4–5 (140–142) 154n201

Q. Steph. (SC 523)

7.4.90–154 (136–140) 238n40–41
 7.5.110–111 (138) 238n39
 7.6–7 (140) 238n43

Eusebius of Emesa

apud Cat. Ex. (TEG 10)

182,10 (152–153) 184n67
 400 (280) 184n67

apud Cat. Gen. (TEG)

10 (1.8,1) 220n55
 27 (1.21) 177n40
 105,1–2 (1.85) 176n34
 106 (1.85) 176n33
 107,1 (1.85) 177n36
 194,1 (1.135) 270n72
 237 (1.167) 91n76
 320 (1.217–218) 179n47
 536 (2.30) 157n211
 719 (2.134) 212n26
 760 (2.160) 85n40
 769 (2.167) 92n84
 778 (2.172) 91n75

apud Cat. Gen. (TEG) (cont.)

781 (2.174)	91n76, 266n57, 309
873 (2.221)	85n40
901–902 (3.18–19)	85n40, 88n55
945 (3.44)	90n71, 91n76
954 (2.50)	91n76
1072 (3.117)	189n88
1158	310
1158 (3.165)	145n164
1181 (3.178)	85n40
1197 (3.186)	88n55
1214 (3.196)	88n55
1267 (3.229)	172
1305,1–2 (3.252)	172
1516 (3.380)	89n64
1840 (3.204)	88n55
2072 (4.320)	185n72
2248 (4.442)	89n64

apud Procop. (GCS NF 22)

<i>ad</i> 1,1 (11,24–28)	220n55
<i>ad</i> 1,2 (17,93–94)	177n41
<i>ad</i> 1,14 (48,106)	177n36
<i>ad</i> 2,6 (96,42)	270n72
<i>ad</i> 2,23 (116,140)	172
<i>ad</i> 3,1 (122,148–149)	179n48
<i>ad</i> 4,2–11 (162–163)	172
<i>ad</i> 4,12 (168)	157n211
<i>ad</i> 6,6 (191,5)	172
<i>ad</i> 9,4–12 (206,1–6)	191n97
<i>ad</i> 22,1–19 (296,77,1–2)	172

<i>ad</i> 24,2–67 (302,1–2)	172
<i>ad</i> 27,34 (333,41)	258n27
<i>ad Gen.</i> 7 (202)	307

Comm. Gen. (Armenian, TEG 15)

pro. (23)	57n79
pro. (24)	149n180
if (26)	220n55
4e (33)	66n124
5a (32)	26n84, 177n41
6b (34)	234n20
6b–c (35)	221n59
8a (38)	177n36
8e (38)	176n33
10b (44)	136n126, 188n84
11,31 (106)	309
12c (46)	270n72
15d (50)	307
16a (54)	190n89

18 (56)	172
19a (56)	196n113
20 (58–70)	82n29, 142n158, 307
21 (70–76)	197n116, 271n74
27 (76)	172
34 (82)	267n60
36c (86)	209n23
46c (95)	212n26
48a (94)	122n58
48b (96–98)	187n79
49a (98)	192n98
50a (100)	91n75
51a (100)	265n54
51b (102)	104n103, 267n60
58a–f (106–108)	182n57
60a (110)	190n94
60b (110)	183n61, 244n59
65a (116)	184n66
78 (130)	282n120
78a (130)	144n163
79 (132)	172
104 (146)	258n27
113 (152)	130n99
115a (155)	247n75
138 (166)	185n72
143 (172)	241n48
143–150 (172–174)	241
157 (168)	310

Eustathius of Antioch*C. Ar.* (CCSG 51)

Frag. 34 (106)	134n114
Frag. 36 (108)	134n114

Galen*De diff. puls.* (CGOA 8)

3.2 (645,17–18)	178n43
-----------------	--------

Gennadius of Constantinople*apud Coisl.* (CCSG 15)

6 (6)	220n57
-------	--------

Gregory of Nazianzus*Ep.* (SC 208)

101,14–15 (42)	155n208
----------------	---------

Or.

18.1 (PG 35.985)	214n35
27.1 (SC 250.70)	77n2

- 27.8 (SC 250.88–92) 77n4
 27.9.4 (SC 250.92) 246n65
 38.10 (SC 358.122,6–7) 257n25
- Gregory of Nyssa**
In XL mart. (GNO 10/1, trans. Leemans)
 II (156,1–12; 107) 80n21
Ad Ablab. (GNO 3/1)
 55.3 135n121
Ad Theoph. (GNO 3/1)
 120–121 243n55
C. Eun. (GNO 1)
 1.395–397 (142–143) 87n49, 135n121
 1.548 (185) 87n49, 135n121
 1.620 (205,11–12) 135n121
 2.87 (252,14–16) 132n110
 2.253 (300) 262n40
De anima (GNO 3/3)
 38,17 214n35
De deitate Filii (GNO 10/2)
 115–144 282n117
Hex. (GNO 4/1)
 1 (6,6–9) 217n42
 8–9 (17,16–17) 218n46
 12 (23) 257n25
 17 (28–29) 119n47
In Cant. (GNO 6)
 8 (246,5–10) 154n202
Opif. (PG 44)
 15 (144–145) 178n43
 24 (177) 178n43
 24 (212d) 280n108
Or. cat. (GNO 3/4)
 30,16–17 197n119
Orat. (GNO 7/2)
 4 (50–52) 260n33
Ref. conf. Eun. (GNO 2/2)
 158 (379) 226n79

Heraclitus

- Probl. Hom.* (WGRW 14)
 41.12 (76) 53n60

Hesychius

- Lex.*
 α' 3760 (SGLG 11/1.175) 119n46
 ε' 62 (HAL 2.3) 120n50

- ε' 252 (HAL 2.9) 115n28
 ε' 2457 (HAL 2.81) 118n43
 ε' 6815 (HAL 2.224) 115n32
 κ' 3606 (HAL 2.511) 118n43
 λ' 1304 (HAL 2.430) 117n41
 μ' 538 (HAL 2.638) 115n32
 σ' 2836 (SGLG 11/3.391) 120n53

Hexapla Traditions**Genesis**

- 1,1 (Aq) 220
 1,2 119n47
 2,23 (Th, Sym) 172
 4,4 (Th) 150n184, 172
 4,12 (Th, Sym) 157
 6,6 (Aq) 172
 24,2 173n21

Hilary

- Tract. Ps.* (CSEL 22)
 125.10 (611) 289n140

Hippolytus

- De David* (CSCO 263)
 10.4 (16) 206n16
Ref. haer. (PTS 25)
 10.6.5 (381) 278n101

Homeric Scholia

- Schol. b in Il.*
 20.253 (Erbse, v 178) 79n16
Schol. bT in Il. (SGHI 4)
 15.56 (22) 112n20
Schol. d in Il. (Van Thiel)
 2.769 (141) 112n22
ad 3,71 (155) 129n92
ad 18,15 (442) 129n92

Irenaeus

- Adv. Haer.* (SC 34)
 3.5.3 (127,21–22) 283n123
 3.23.5 (190,7–15) 127n82

Jerome

- Comm. in Proph.* (CCSL 76)
ad Dan., pro. 214n34
ad Mic. 2,11–13 (455–456) 239n45

- De vir. inl.* (TU 14/1)
129 (54) 165m1
- Ep.* (CSEL 54)
51.5.4 (404) 271n76
- Ep.* (CSEL 56)
131.11 (211–212) 268n66
- Heb. Q. Gen.* (Hayward)
1.2 (30) 26n85
- Interp. Hebr. nom.* (CCSL 72/1)
Bale (62) 145n164
pro. (59–60) 145n166
- John Chrysostom(?)**
Synopsis Scripturae sacrae
PG 56.315, 318 153n196
- John Chrysostom**
Ad pop. Ant. (PG 49)
7.1–3 (93–95) 49n44
7.4 (96) 51n52
9.2 (105) 51n53
9.3 (107) 59n87
16.4 (49.165–166) 84n30
- Ad Stag.* (PG 47)
9 (446) 101n101
- Adv. Iud.* (PG 48)
7.5 (923) 59n90
8 (931) 289n140
- C. Anom.* (SC 28^{bis})
4.83 (234) 137n130
- Cat.* (SC 50)
1.21.2–3 (119) 226n80
3.17–18 (161.9–13) 51n56, 174n27
- Cat. ult. ad bapt.* (SC 366)
3.1.7–25 (212–214) 61n95
- Comm. Isa.* (SC 304)
5.3 (222) 42n15, 139n143
5.8.65–66 (250) 58n83
7.8.37–38 (330) 150n184
8.3.1–13 (330) 139n142
- De christ. prec.* = *C. anom. hom.* 10 (SC 396)
248 (258) 61n96
- De consub.* = *C. anom. hom.* 7 (SC 396)
245–250 (132) 61n97
- De mut. nom. hom.* (PG 51)
2.3 (129) 51n51, 152n192
4.3 (148) 60n91
- De proph. obsc.* (VS 12)
2.2.30–34 (116) 152n191
2.2.34–56 (116–117) 146n168
- De sacerd.* (SC 272)
4.5 (263) 78n11
- De ss. martyr.* (PG 50)
1 (646) 168n12
- De virg.* (SC 125)
30.2 (190,29) 132n110
- Exp. in Ps.* (PG 55)
145 (53.522) 194n104
- Exp. in Ps IV* (PG 55)
8 (50) 59n90
- Exp. in Ps. CXIII* (PG 55)
2 (307) 84n33
6 (53.313) 132n108
- Ex. in Ps. XLVIII* (PG 55)
2 (225) 107n4
- Hom. Dicta praes. Imperatore* (PG 63)
3–4 (475–476) 198n125
- Illum. Cat.* (SC)
1.8.5 (126) 107n1
- In Acta apost. Hom.* (PG 60)
9.4 (80) 198n125
11.2 (95) 134n115
- In Col. hom.* (EP 5)
3 (201e) 226n80
- In ep. i ad Thess. hom.* (EP 5)
6 (386–388) 198n125
- In ep. ad Eph. hom.* (EP 4)
1 (114d) 136n129
- In ep. ad Heb. hom.* (EP 7)
8 (110d–111b) 146n168
22 (251.10–13) 150n184, 172
22 (253d) 199n133
- In ep. ad Rom. hom.* (EP 1)
18 (311c) 285n128
24 (388c) 136n129
- In ep. ii ad Cor. hom.* (EP 3)
3 (44) 172, 150n184
8 (101) 132n109
13 (153e) 149n181
26 (269e) 149n181
- In ep. i ad Tim.* (EP 6)
9 (71e) 84n30
- In ep. ii ad Tim. hom.* (EP 6)
3 (186d) 125n71

In faciem et restiti (PG 51)

6 (377) 132n110

In Gen. hom. (PG, FOC)

1 (53.21–26) 49n43
 1.1–4 (53.23–26) 209–216
 1.3 (53.24, 74.25) 88n57, 155n206
 1.4 (53.25) 213n28, 213n31
 2.2 (53.27–28) 51n54, 84n30, 85n36,
 119n47
 2.3 (53.29) 66n124
 2.4 (53.30–31) 278n103, 116n35,
 119n46
 3.1 (53.32–34) 62n101, 63n105,
 66n122, 93n91,
 177n39, 219n52
 3.2–3 (53.34–35) 220n53, 287n134
 3.4 (53.37) 286n129
 4.3 (53.41–43) 133n112, 234n22
 4.4 (53.42–44) 51n55, 66n121,
 146n168, 151n185,
 254n10
 5.5 (53.53) 222n61, 254n10
 6.5 (53.59, 73.85) 176n32
 8.1 (53.70) 63n105, 225n75
 8.2 (53.71–72, 74.107) 65n115, 89n67,
 225n78
 8.3 (53.72) 225n76, 275n89
 8.4 (53.73, 74.112) 35n127, 225n77
 9.1 (53.76–77) 64n109
 9.3–4 (54.78–79) 84n30, 91n79,
 276n94
 10.3 (53.84) 62n101
 11.1 (53.92) 33n116
 11.7 (53.98) 84n31, 86n47,
 188n83, 268n65
 12.1 (53.99–100, 74.158–159) 85n36, 136n125,
 136n127
 12.2 (53.100) 269n68
 12.3 (53.101) 85n41
 13.1 (53.106) 277n100
 13.2 (53.106–108) 194n103, 273n81
 13.3 (53.107–108, 74.175) 91n78, 92n85,
 93n94
 13.3–4 (53.108–110) 125n71, 126n74,
 270n73
 14.1 (53.111) 86n46, 92n82,
 125n70–71

14.2 (53.112–113) 86n48
 14.3 (53.114, 74.186) 93n89, 134n118
 14.4 (53.115, 74.188) 79n13, 190n90
 15.1 (53.119) 63n106, 89n66,
 94n95
 15.2 (53.121, 74.199) 92n83, 134n118,
 134n120
 15.3 (53.122–123, 74.201) 172
 16.1 (53.125–126) 63n105
 16.2 (53.127) 85n38, 179n46
 16.5 (53.131–133) 84n30–31, 127n81,
 141n152
 17.2 (53.136) 195n107
 17.9 (53.147) 84n30, 92n80, 92n82
 18.2 (53.150) 89n62, 196n115
 18.3 (53.151–152) 33n117, 85n42, 116n35
 18.4 (53.154) 64n110
 18.5 (53.155, 82.14–15) 115n29, 116n34,
 121n55
 19.2 (53.161) 93n87
 19.3 (53.162) 93n94
 19.5 (53.164) 62n102, 92n82,
 94n96, 209
 19.6 (53.165) 121n57
 20 (166–173) 161
 20.1 (53.166–167, 82.36) 62n101, 149n175,
 149n179, 152n195,
 264n47
 20.2 (53.168) 287n133, 289n142
 20.5 (53.172–173) 63n108
 21.1 (53.175–176) 63n106, 88n59
 21.3–4 (53.178–180) 63n107, 65n119, 198–
 200
 21.4 (53.180–181, 82.60) 87n51, 130n93
 21.5 (53.181–182, 82.62) 149n175, 254n11,
 261n37, 265n51
 22.2 (53.188) 93n87
 22.3 (53.189–190) 125n71, 126n74,
 128n87, 274n85
 22.5 (53.192, 82.79–80) 172
 23.4 (53.201–202) 128n86, 286n131
 23.5 (53.204) 63n108
 24.1 (53.207) 115n30, 118n42

In Gen. hom. (PG, FOC) (cont.)

- 24.5 (53.213) 85n42
 24.6 (53.213) 84n31
 25.1 (53.219) 185n70
 25.4 (53.224) 93n87
 26.3 (53.232, 82.149–150)
 66n123, 115n29,
 122n60
 26.4 (53.234–235, 82.153)
 85n36, 131n101,
 254n12
 27.1 (53.341) 63n105
 27.2 (53.241) 62n101
 27.4 (53.246) 192n99
 27.5 (54.246) 273n82
 28.2 (53.252–254, 82.166)
 91n74, 187n77
 28.3 (53.264) 85n36
 28.4 (53.256–257, 82.192)
 79n14, 84n30, 85n36,
 92n82, 266n58, 267n61
 28.5 (53.258, 82.193) 87n52
 28.8 (53.251) 86n45
 29 (53.260–273, 82.198–219)
 94–105
 29.1 (53.260) 34n123
 29.2 (53.264) 266n56
 29.3 (53.264) 265n53
 29.6 (53.269) 92n82, 286n132,
 289n141
 29.7 (53.270–271, 82.214)
 65n117, 138n139,
 283n121
 30.1–2 (53.274–275) 254n13
 30.2 (53.276, 82.225) 93n88
 30.3 (53.325) 262n42
 30.4 (53.279, 82.230) 149n176, 153n196
 31.1 (53.307) 88n59
 31.3 (53.285–286, 82.243)
 71n130, 89n61,
 116n35, 116n38,
 118n44, 182n58
 32.2 (53.294) 183n62, 244n59,
 245n61, 246n66
 32.3 (53.296, 82.259–260)
 115n29, 115n29,
 115n31, 115n32,
 191n95, 254n14,
 255n17
 33.1 (53.305–307) 45n28, 62n100
 34.4 (53.311) 255n15
 35.1 (53.313) 286n130
 35.3 (53.325) 116n35, 116n37
 35.4 (53.326) 88n58
 35.5 (53.327–328, 82.315)
 65n120, 149n175,
 149n178, 153n198
 35.6 (53.329, 82.318) 115n30, 120n53
 36.1 (53.332–333) 34n122, 71n130
 37 (53.341–350, 82.340–354)
 67–75
 37.2 (53.343) 255n16
 37.3 (53.346) 184n68
 39.2 (53.363, 82.378) 132n107
 39.3 (53.364–365) 63n103, 130n93,
 146n170, 149n178,
 151n189
 40.1 (53.369) 62n101
 40.4 (53.367) 93n90
 41.2 (53.376) 88n59
 41.3 (53.378) 188n86
 42.3 (53.388) 93n92
 42.3–4 (53.389) 198n122
 43.1 (53.396) 247n73
 44.2 (53.408) 286n129
 44.4 (53.410–411) 64n112, 84n31
 46.3 (54.426) 88n59
 47.1–2 (54.429–443) 130n93
 47.3 (54.432) 281n113
 48.2 (54.436–437, 87.29)
 172, 174n26
 49.1 (54.445) 85n36, 89n65
 51.1 (54.452, 87.57–58)
 149n175, 152n194,
 153n197
 52.1 (54.457) 115n28
 53.3 (54.468) 126n77
 53.5 (54.470, 87.89) 115n28, 116n35
 54.5 (54.478) 255n18, 260n30
 56.3 (54.490) 62n100, 63n104
 56.4 (54.491, 87.126) 147n173
 57.2 (54.496) 130n93
 58.2 (54.509–510, 87.159–160)
 149n175, 154–155,
 247n71
 59.2 (54.516, 87.170) 115n29, 117n41
 60.3 (54.523) 67n125
 60.4 (54.519) 62n100

62.2 (53-534-535) 149n175, 153n199,
235-239
63.4 (54-545) 149n175, 152n195
65.1 (54-559, 87-244) 115n29, 116n33
65.3 (54-562, 87-249-250)
126n74, 127n84
66.2 (54-567-568, 87-258)
125n71, 140n146,
186n74, 141n150
66.3 (54-569-570, 87-260-262)
120n49, 141n151
67.2 (54-535) 65n116
67.2 (54-573-575, 87-268-269)
65n116, 125n71,
137n131, 137n135,
240-243
67.4 (54-577) 138n137
67.5 (54-578) 138n140
In Heb. hom. (EP 7)
17 (207c-d) 153n198
26 (290c) 107n2
In Jo. hom. (PG 59)
15/14.1 (97) 61n99
In Matt. hom. (HM)
3 (1.31-32) 236-237
5 (1.64-65) 131n102
7 (1.88c) 151n187,
151n188
7.1 (1.87) 59n89
10 (1.123d) 125n71
13 (1.19a) 149n181
16 (1.228) 151n186
59 (2.183c) 251n7
In Oz. hom. (SC 277)
2.2.49-70 (94-95) 86n44
2.2.85-87 (96) 147n170
2.3.1-2 (97) 48n40
2.3.12-14 (96) 152n195
In prin. Acta (PG 51)
1.3 (71) 85n43
2.1 (77) 59n88
In sanct. Eust. (PG 50)
3 (603) 149n181
In. Phil. hom. (EP 5)
4 (33b-c) 107n3
Incomp. (SC 28^{bis})
2.328-230 (168) 61n95
4.270 (249) 61n97
5.74-95 (276-278) 87n49

Laus Diod. (PG 52)
3-4 (763-766) 169n15
Obsc. (VS 12)
1.6.50 (98) 58n84
1.7.41-61 (102-104) 58n85
2.1.16-19 (108) 48n42
2.2.25 (114) 59n86
2.2.31 (116) 59n86
2.3.1-13 (118) 58n85
2.6.59 (142) 58n84
Pet. Mat. fil. Zeb. (= *C. anom. hom.* 8) (SC
396)
56-57 (172) 61n96
Profect. Ev. (PG 51)
12 (320) 60n92
Serm. Gen. (SC 433)
2.2 (188-190) 225n77
2.83-85 (188) 60n93, 65n115
7.190-192 (320) 142n154
7.222-227 (322) 142n154
8.26-27 (348) 142n154
Sermo 9 in Gen. (PG 54)
3 (625) 152n190
3-5 (624-628) 146n70
5 (628) 149n181, 150n182
Theatr. (PG 56)
3 (546) 247n73

Josephus

Ant. Jud. (F10)
1.34 (10,12) 152n193

Julian (Emperor)

C. Gal. (apud Cyril, *C. Jul.*, GCS NF 20)
Fr. 4 [Mas] (100) 263n45
Fr. 15 [Mas] (189) 179n44
Fr. 17 [Mas] (207-209) 30n101
Fr. 17 [Mas] (207) 143n160

Justin

Dial. (PAR 47/1)
62.2 (350) 224n71

Methodius

Conu. (SC 95)
9.1 (266) 305

Origen*apud Cat. Gen.* (TEG)

191 (1.133)	306
193 (1.134)	218n46
258 (1.179)	92n84
475 (1.303)	307
541 (2.32)	207n17
688 (2.117)	85n40
783 (2.175)	309
851 (2.209)	262n41
879 (3.6)	132n110
910 (3.22)	255n15
953 (3.49)	255n16
1152 (3.161)	310
1205 (3.190)	85n37
1252 (3.219)	281n114
1657 (4.92)	247n74
2087 (4.327)	120n51
2108 (4.342)	310
2164 (4.380)	241n50

apud Coisl. (CCSG 15)

73 (73)	275n92, 276n95
121 (124–125)	54n65, 92n84, 197n117
160 (156–157)	87n54, 104n103, 266n59, 267n62, 308, 309

apud Procop. (GCS NF 22)

13.7 (244)	310
------------	-----

C. Cels. (SVC 54)

1.20 (22.9–13)	29n97
4.37 (251,22)	277n98
4.38 (255.5–7)	179n44
4.40 (256–258)	197n117
4.42 (259,6)	256n19
4.45 (262,4–17)	264n46
4.56 (273)	279n107
6.49 (427,17–25)	135n123
6.59 (436,25–26)	125n72
6.60 (437,10–20)	136n128
6.70 (447,13–14)	126n75
6.71 (448)	279n106
7.60 (511,22–26)	124n68
8.40 (554)	104n104–105, 286n132, 309

C. Mt. (GCS 40)

10.5 (5; 1 36–37)	56n77
17.24 (600–669)	196n111

C. Rom. (AGLB 10)

1.21 (88,40–52)	274n87
-----------------	--------

Cant. (GCS 33)

3 (211)	286n131
---------	---------

Cath. in Ps. (TU 183)

4.13–21 (16–18)	185n70, 308
-----------------	-------------

Comm. Eph. (JThS 3)

Frag. 8,22 (242)	72n135
Frag. 22,9–19 (556–557)	126n78

Comm. Mt. (GCS 41/1)

Frag. 53 (36)	282n115
Frag. 81 (48)	286n130
Frag. 137.2 (68–69)	286n131

Comm. Rom. (JThS 14)

41.1 (15)	84n33
-----------	-------

Comm. serm. Mt. (GCS 38)

125 (261,17–18)	239n45
-----------------	--------

De prin. (Behr)

1.3.6 (I, 76,143–146)	274n84
2.11.6 (II, 278,159–160)	272n80

4.1.7 (II, 478–480)	56n77
---------------------	-------

4.3.1 (II, 518,243–250)	272n80
4.3.6–7 (II, 536–538)	207n17

4.3.14–15 (II, 556)	54n65
---------------------	-------

4.4.6 (II, 573,164)	279n105, 280n109
---------------------	---------------------

4.4.7 (II, 574,182)	280n108
---------------------	---------

De. orat. (GCS 3)

13.4 (328,8–10)	260n35
27.1 (363,29)	260n34
27.1–7 (365–367)	255n18
27.4 (365,9)	260n31
27.13 (372,10–11)	126n73

Def. (TU 183)

1–7 (66–68)	112n25
-------------	--------

Frag. Luc. (GCS 49)

140 (283,12)	195n111
--------------	---------

Hom. Ex. (GCS 30)

8.6 (232–233)	286n129
---------------	---------

Hom. Ez. (GCS 33)

3.8 (356)	286n131
-----------	---------

Hom. Gen. (GCS NF 17)

1.17 (33–34)	206n16
2.3 (43,13–14)	261n36
5.4 (93,9–16)	264n49

Hom. In Luc. (GCS 49)

13 (79,3–4)	81n22
-------------	-------

Hom. in Ps. XXXVI (GCS NF 19)

3.2 (253,16) 221n59

3.4 (144,4-5) 178n43

Hom. in Ps. LXXVI (GCS NF 19)

3.2 (332-333) 81n25

Hom. in Ps. LXXVII (GCS NF 19)

6.2 (429,2-3) 274n88

Hom. Jer. (SC 238)

14.18 (108) 286n129

19.13-43-45 (228) 147n171

Hom. Jesu nave (GCS 30)

3.4 (306,2-5) 283n122

Hom. Lev. (GCS 29)

3.4 (308,5-23) 287n133

Hom. Num. (GCS 30)

23.4 (216,23-24) 268n66

23.4 (216) 305

In Deut. (PG 12)

ad 25,3 (816) 212n26

In Jo. (GCS 10)

6.51.264 (160,6) 282n115

6.52.269-270 (161,12-13) 282n116

6.150.1 85n37

6.70 (121,1-7) 198n126

13.106-107 (242) 132n110

20.25 (360-362) 207n117

28.13-15 (404-408) 265n52

28.20 (415) 265n52

Philoc. (SC 302)

14 (406-412) 175n29, 305

Proæm. (TU 183)

1,1-2 (102) 54n65

1,26-28 (104) 54n65

Sel. in Ez. (PG 13)

1,26 (769d) 173n23

Sel. in Ps. (PG 12)

ad 2,1-2 (1104c-d) 56n74

Paladius*Dial.* (SC 341)

5,34-40 (110-112) 205n12

Philo*Cherub.* (PAO 1)

12 (172-173) 158n212

Conf. (PAO 2)

6-9 (231) 254n13

6-13 (231-232) 262n41

Fug. (PAO 3)

178-183 (149-150) 269n69

Immut. (PAO 2)

24 (61,9-10) 194n104

Leg. (PAO 1)

3.77 (129,22) 261n36

Migr. (PAO 2)

132 (294,4) 132n110

Opif. (PAO 1)

126 (200,5) 251n7

131 (45,13) 269n69

Post. (PAO 2)

33 (8,18-22) 264n49

Q. Gen. (OPA 33)

1.1 (41-42) 306

1.3 (42-43) 269n70

2.26 (100) 122n58

2.59 (114) 273n83

2.66 (120) 262n39

Q. Gen. (Aucher)

2.38 (116) 254n12

4.235 (432) 255n17

Quis rerum (OPA 15)

159-160 (242-243) 257n25

Photius, Bibl. (Henry)

172-174 (II, 168) 79n18

Polychronius*Job.* (PTS 40)

pro. 2 (151,3) 55n70

Porphry*C. Chris.* (TK 52)

Fr. 6. (133,19-20) 54n66

De phil. ex. orac. (apud Eusebius, PE, GCS

43/1)

Fr. 109 (117,7-8) 52n58

Quaest. Hom. ad Il. (TK 36)

6,265 (116) 268n64

18,591-592 (232) 79n17

Ps-Athanasius*Comm. Ps.* (PG 27)

ad 108,17 (457-458) 117n41

Ps-Gregory Thaumaturgus*In ann. Sanc.*

PG 10.1152 152n193

Ps-Origen?

apud Cat. Gen. (TEG)
1838 (4.202) 238n45

Ps-Plutarch

Vit. Hom. (BT)
2.14 (14–15) 111n15

Severian of Gabala

De mundi creatione (PG 56)
6.1 (484) 82n28
6.3 (487) 82n29
apud Cat. ad Acta (CGPNT 3)
2.16 (32,9) 84n33
In fil. Prod. (PG 59)
1 (632) 79n15

Severus of Antioch

Frag. III Rg. (TEG 14)
49 (136) 256n21
Frag. Deut. (TEG 14)
50 (44) 104n104

Sextus Empiricus

Adv. Gramm. (SEO 3)
1.84 (23,1–2) 124n65
1.241–251 (60–62) 111n15, 144n161

Simplicius

In Phys. (CAG 9)
1.4 (170,9–11) 219n49

Socrates

Hist. eccl. (GCS NF 1)
2.9.3 (98,14–16) 229n4
3.25.14 (226,22) 226n79
5.22.53 (302,11–12) 190n93
6.3.6–7 (314,7–12) 165n2
6.4.9 (316,12–13) 19n6
7.36.20 (386,6–8) 206n14

Sozomen

Hist. eccl. (GCS 50)
7.9.6 (312,17–18) 169n15
8.2.6 (350,18–22) 165n2

ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ (Lex.)

Lex.
σ' 397 (SGLG 10.455) 120n53

Tertullian

Adv. Hermog. (CCSL 1)
4.1 (1.400) 119n47

Adv. Marc. (CCSL 1)

2.15.2 (1.492) 104n104, 288n140
De jej. (CSEL 2)
7–8 (1260–1270) 213n30

Theodore? / Diodore?

apud Coisl. (CCSG 15)
115 (118–119) 143n159

Theodore?

apud Cat. Gen. (TEG)
190 (1.132) 306

Theodore

Adv. Jul. (BTP 24)
3.2–3 (80) 212n26
apud BL add. 17,217
JFCS 25/2.237–239 193n102
apud Cat. Gal. (CGPNT 6)
ad 5,15 (80–81) 129n90
apud Cat. Gen. (TEG)
104,4 (1.83) 176n33
190 (1.132) 136n126
348 (1.235) 196n114
445 (1.286) 196n114
445 (286) 197n118
apud Cat. Jo. (ST 141)
Frag. III (377,4–6) 282n118
apud Cat. Rom. (Staab)
8,5–6 (134,26) 84n33
apud Coisl. (CCSG 15)
76,33 (81) 188n83
110 (115) 307
120 (123–124) 197n118
apud Marc. Gr. 573
Mus 100.274–278 193n102
apud Procop. (GCS NF 22)
ad 1,14 (49,177) 176n33
apud Theodore bar Koni, Scol. (CSCO 65)
1 (28.21–25) 222n64
Comm. in XII proph. (GO 5/1)
ad Am. 9,6 (152,16–21) 139n145
ad Mic. 5,1–2 (213,23) 151n188

- ad Os.* 12,11 (67,7–9) 142n156
ad Zach. 14,20 (399,10–11) 140n148
Comm. in Ps. (ST 93)
ad 20,14 (120,5–6) 126n72
ad 32,7b (149,15–17) 126n76
ad 33,8 (161) 112n24
ad 56,2 (369,15–18) 131n103
ad 74,2a (500,6–7) 130n97
Comm. Jo. (CSCO 115)
7, *ad* 20,1 (343,11–16) 222n64
Frag. Gen. (Sachau)
1 (4,1–3) 234n21
1 (8,20) 220n54
2 (5,14–26) 196n114
Hom. Cat. (ST 145)
8,55 (193) 155n209
Tr. c. all. (CSCO 189)
3 (9,8–24) 18n50
3 (8,20–21) 243n54
3,9–20 (8–9) 271n74
Theodoret
Eran. (Ettlinger)
1.68 (111) 212n26
Dial. 3 (253,7) 167n8
Hist. eccl. (GCS 5)
5.3 (279–280) 169n15
5.40 (348,1–4) 169n15
Interp. ep. ad Heb. (PG 82)
ad 12,22–23 (777) 282n119
Interp. In Ezech. (PG 81)
ad 1,10 (825) 241n49
Q. Ex. (LEC 1)
40.2 (290) 184n65

- Q. Gen.* (LEC 1)
pro. 1–2 (2) 22n71
pro. 3 (2) 84n35
pro. 4 (2) 55n68
pro. 18–19 (4) 77n1
8,1 (24) 26n86
11 (28–30) 234n21
21 (56) 188n83
22,3 (58) (53.365) 136n126
22,6–10 (58) 269n71
23 (58) 274n84
25 (61) 271n79
39 (86–88) 197n116
39,1 (86) 92n86
53 (112) 187n78
111 (202) 186n76

Theophilus of Antioch

- Ad Aut.* (Grant)
2.4 (26) 119n47
2.13 (48) 178n43
2.19 (57) 269n71
2.28 (70) 179n48
3.19 (124) 261n36

Timaeus Locrus

- De nat. mund.* (PhAnt 24)
52, 219d11 (140) 178n43

Titus of Bostra

- C. Man.* (CCSG 82)
3.7 (251) 82n29, 306
3.7.9 (251) 180n52
3.23 (277–278) 307